

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XX, I.

WHOLE No. 77.

I.—THE GREEK VERBAL IN -TEO.

PART I.

The etymology of the ending -teo is disputed. It is usually explained as standing for *tefjos*, akin to the Sanskrit ending -*tavja*; so, e. g., Donaldson, *The New Cratylus*³, p. 641, et al. Brugmann maintains that it stands for -*tefo*, Skt. -*tavya* (*Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik*, II, I, p. 424). To these theories two objections are being urged: 1st, the ending -*tavya* is very rare in the oldest Sanskrit: it is foreign to the language of the Rig-Veda, and in the Atharva-Veda only two instances of its use can be found (Whitney, *Skt. Gr.*, §§962 ff.; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, §§221 ff.). 2d, the ending -teo is as foreign to the oldest Greek: we do not meet it as a Gerund at all in Homer, nor can we prove that its use becomes even tolerably common for several centuries after Homer's time. It is quite probable, therefore, that the ending is a "Weiterbildung" of -tos (Curtius) or -tus, Lat. -*tum* (Westphal, *Grammatik*², I, p. 297). But the Skt. ending -*tavya* is itself composed of the infinitive ending -*tu*, + *yā*. The absence of either of these endings in the oldest monuments of their respective languages inclines us to the assumption that they are not sprung from a common Indo-European original, and inclines us the more to credit the words of the Scholiast to Dionysios Thrax (*Anecd. Bekk.* II, p. 950): *γίνονται δὲ ταῦτα ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς τὸς ῥηματικῶν ὀνομάτων, προσθέσει τοῦ ε ποιητικῶς, οἷον ποιητός ποιητέος, πλευστός πλευστέος*. But Curtius goes too far, when stating that the -teo-formations differed at first only

slightly (in meaning?) from those in *-τος*. What statistics the present condition of the literature affords us are dead against that position, as is also the inner nature of the *-τεο*-verbal, which postulates a demonstrable verb-stem from which to be derived, and is itself a mood-participle to that verb. While, then, I have counted 283 *-τος*-formations in Homer, the *-τεο*-formations are unknown to the Homeric thesaurus, since neither *έτεός* (Classen to the contrary notwithstanding, *Beobachtungen über den Hom. Sprachgebrauch*, p. 197) nor *νηγάτεος* is a verbal in *-τέος*. A final argument against the identity of the Gk. and Skt. endings is the accent. While in Skt. the accent could be either *tanvā* or *tānva*, the accent in Gk. is suspiciously immobile, and adds somewhat to the support of Curtius' theory that from *-τος* came *-τεjos*, *-τεFos*, *-τειος* (actually occurring in Hesiod, Theog. 310, *φατειός*; Scut. Herc. 144 and 161), finally *τέος*. But the final form of the verbal does not as yet appear in Hesiod, for Gross (I, p. 10)¹ was too hasty in announcing *φυκτέος* as a verbal, in Hesiod, fg. 93 of the Catalogus (p. 117, epicorum Graecorum fragmenta, ed. Kinkel, vol. I). The words of the Scholiast to Pind. Ol. X (XI) 46 are: *τὴν πόλιν δὲ καλεῖσθαι φασὶ φύκτεον* (v. l. *φυκτέαν*) *ἀπὸ τίνος Φυκτέως, οὗ μέμνηται καὶ Ἡσίοδος οὕτω*, then follows the quotation, of which the part *φυκτέος ἀγλαὸς υἱός* contains Boeckh's conjecture for *φυκτέως*. Besides all this, the verbal *φυκτέος* does not occur in the period to which our investigations are restricted—from Homer to Aristotle exclusive.

From what part of the verb-organism is the verbal derived, if 'derived' at all? Curiously enough, it seems that the Greeks themselves generally reckoned these verbalia among the passive forms of the verb, although the demonstrably passive forms—the personally-used gerundives—are decidedly in the numerical

¹ The following are among the more noteworthy contributions to the literature on the subject of the verbal adjective in *-τέος*:—*Moisisstzig*, Quaestiones de adiectivis Graecis, quae dicuntur, verbalibus. Four particulae: I Conitz 1844, II Conitz 1853, III Conitz 1861; the fourth I have striven in vain to procure. I is a general introduction, II is on Plato's use, III (the least satisfactory) is on Demosthenes' usage. *Gross*, de adiectivis verbalibus in *τος* et *τεος* exeuntibus; 3 programs; *Marienwerder*, 1839, 1847 and 1854. *Kopetsch*, de verbalibus in *τος* et *τέος* Platonicis dissertatio, cui intextae sunt breves de Homericis adnotationes, 1860; a Lyck-program: quite good. *Schulze*, Quaestiunculae grammaticae ad oratores Atticos spectantes; a Bautzen-program of 1889: very useful. *Karlowa*, Bemerkungen zum Sprachgebrauch des Demosthenes, mit Berücksichtigung anderer attischer Redner; a Pleiss-program, 1883.

minority. If the -τεο-formations are a later growth from the -τος-adjectives, we should expect their relations to the corresponding verb-stem to be identical; nor are we disappointed.

My statistics are as follows:

From Homer to Aristotle, exclusive, there are about 286 separate verbs which furnish us with -τεο-formations. Of that number 159 show precisely the same stem-form, letter for letter, in the verbal as in the stem of the I. aor. pass.

In stating this number, however, we differ with Gross, I, who refers some of those verbalia to the pf. pass. or II. aor. or future; e. g. it is better to refer *εὐρετέον* to the I. aor. pass. rather than to the II. aor. act. or mid., which leaves an *ε* unexplained. Similarly it is better to refer *θηρατέον* to the stem of a I. aor. pass. which does exist, than to a pf. pass. which does not. *κρουστέον* is better not referred to the stem as seen in the pf., since those pf. forms without the *σ* are pretty generally preferred to those with *σ* (cf. Blass-Kühner, Gr. Gr., p. 467, etc.).

But we are to add to the above 159 cases 38 others, in which the stem of the verb in I. aor. pass. differs from that of the verbal only by the insignificant difference of the aspiration of the final stem-consonant before the *θ* of the aor. ending: *πεμπτέον*, *ἐπέμφθην*, etc.; thus we count $159 + 38 = 197$ cases of practical identity between verbal stem and stem of verb in I. aor. pass. Omitting cases like *βιωτέον* (cf. Blass-Kühner, p. 384), *διασκηνητέον* (cf. A. J. P. XIII, pp. 12-13), *κοινωνητέον*, etc., in which the I. aor. pass. itself is not producible, but can easily be restored from the fut. pass. of said verb, we next note the five verbalia which are to be referred to the future stem of the verb: *ἐκτέα*, *συνεστέον*, *θρεκτέον*, *οιστέα*, *πενστέον* (? cf. Blass-Kühner, §231, 3). We conveniently classify the following 14 verbalia as more or less "irregular." *ἐχθαρτέος* we prefer identifying with the stem of the presupposed form **εχθαρος*, whence Curtius (*Verbum*², I, p. 372) evolves *ἐχθρός*: I find no warrant for Gross's (I, p. 4) pf. pass. from which he derives it. *ἐλκτέον* is one of the two verbalia which are derived from *ελκω*: the one is derived directly from the I. aor. pass. *εἰλκύσθην*, *ελκυστέος*; the other, *ελκτέον*, is preferably referred to the present stem, as a secondary form, *ελκύσω*, appears in the future. Blass-Kühner asserts that the vowel of *θύω* is either long or short in the present, long in fut. or aor., short in pf. (or aor. passive). Then the length of the stem-vowel is our only guide in referring *θυτέον* to its verb-stem. Unfortunately, the only passage in poetry

in which I have found it—Ar., Av. 1237—does not of itself *prove* whether its measuring is *θύτιον* or *θύτιον*. Until further instances of its use are found in the poets, we must question the correctness of L. and Scott's *θύτιον*. *θετίον* may be referred to II. aor. act. or middle (so Gross). "De *ιτητίον*," says Lobeck, *Pathologiae sermonis graeci prolegomena*, p. 146, "incertus sum utrum ab obsoleto *ιτέω* declinatum sit, cui simillima sunt *βατέω*, *βοτέω*, *δοτέω*, *πατέω*, an pro *ιτιτέον* receptum mutata propter epalleliam vocali ut intus aucta *ἡνίπατε* et *ἐρύκακε* pro *ἐρύκυκε*, *ἡνίπιτε*." Since Lobeck's time the matter has been pretty well settled in favor of the former theory: "*ιτητίον* ist aus dem mit lat. *itare* völlig identischen **ιταω* herzuleiten" (Curtius, *Verbum*², I 342), "das sich jetzt durch das elische *ἐπ-αν-ιτα-κώρ*, d. i. **ἐπ-αν-ιτη-κώς* belegen lässt"; cf. Blass-Kühner, II, §292, A. 2. *ιτέον* shows the pres. stem of the verb as it appears in the dual and plural of the ind.; similarly *φατέον*. *ιστέον* seems to contain the II. aor. stem *ι*; cf. Skt. *√vid* 'to know,' with euphonic change of *δ* to *σ*. Both the pf. and II. aor. of *ἀποκείρω* exhibit the combination *καρ*: only the more frequent occurrence of the aorist favors our referring *ἀποκαρτέον* to that tense-stem. *ἀποκμητέον* would be referred to the perfect stem of *ἀποκάμνω*; but the verbal itself is a v. l. in Plat., Civ. 445b for *ἀποκνητέον*; cf. Blass-Kühner, p. 454. *παιστέον* shows a *σ* by euphony for *δ* before *τ*; cf. the Doric, or better Aeolic, *παίσδω*. It cannot be determined whether the second *σ* in *σωστέον* be identical with that in e. g. *σέσωσμαι*, etc., or whether it is that perplexing *σ* which "hat . . . seinen Grund in der Vermischung eines *Verbum σώω* (aus *σάσω*) mit *σώζω*" (Curtius, *Vb.*² II, p. 401). Whether Aristophanes inserted the *σ* in *ἀπαρυστέον* metri gratia (Eq. 921) or not is not known. If the *α* in *δυσχεραντέον* is long by nature (the word occurs only in Plato), we refer the verbal to the stem of I. aor. *ἐδυσχέρῃνα*.

As indicated above, some verbs correspond to two verbalia, e. g. *μαχετίον* and *μαχητέον*, *οιστία* and *-ενεκτέον*, *έλκτέον* and *ελκυστέον*, *έτία* and *σχετίον*. The great bulk of these verbalia are connected with *ω*-verbs, the next greater number represent *μαι*-verbs, the fewest, *μι*-verbs. The statistics are fairly accurate:

Verbalia 'derived' from <i>ω</i> -verbs,	1320
" " " <i>μαι</i> -verbs,	313
" " " <i>μι</i> -verbs,	198
Total,	1831

Verbals from μ -verbs occur once in 9 cases; those from $\mu\alpha\iota$ -verbs once in 6 cases; those from ω -verbs once in $1\frac{1}{2}$ cases. And yet the authors vary. Herodotus uses only ω -verbalia, with one single exception; Thucydides shows great freedom, not only in the matter of derivation, but also in using a much greater number of different verbalia, while one almost wearies of Herodotus' constant repetition of $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\nu$. Thucydides never repeats the same verbal more than twice. In this, as in other matters, Xenophon shows different preferences in different spheres of composition: he is far from being partial to ω -neuters (one case occurring in the Apology), while there is an unusually large number of μ -transitives and intransitives in the Cynegeticus. Aristophanes admits verbalia from ω -neuter verbs much more freely than the tragedians do, especially in his later pieces. Nearly half of the verbalia showing the middle sense of their verbs (98 in toto) occur in Plato alone, and of this number 45, nearly the half, in the Republic alone. Among the orators it is not until we have passed Antiphon, Andocides and Lysias that we find any $-\tau\epsilon\omicron$ -verbal derived from a neuter verb, or any verbal showing the middle force of an ω -verb. Isaeus resuscitated Antiphon's preference for $\mu\alpha\iota$ -transitives. Demosthenes avoids μ - and $\mu\alpha\iota$ -transitives, and his verbals seem to contain the middle force of the verb only twice, $\pi\rho\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\nu$ and $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\nu$. Many of the distinctions on which these statistics are based are necessarily extremely subtle, and mathematical precision is therefore impossible. No one would welcome corrections to the above, and other, statistics more gladly than the writer.—There are three possible classes of verbals, viz. simplicia, syntheta, parasyntheta. It is a fact, which at first excites our surprise, that the syntheta are practically not represented at all in the $-\tau\epsilon\omicron$ verbalia. For the only syntheton that I find at all is $\delta\nu\sigma\mu\alpha\chi\eta\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\nu$, a word occurring only 5 times in all—once in Sophocles, 4 times in Plato. Nor is Sophocles' use of it—an innovation bold even for Sophocles—free from suspicion, as the verse (Antig. 106) is a bungling one, and after all there may be some especial significance in the Scholiast's $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\tau\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \delta\nu\varsigma$. As between the simplicia and parasyntheta there is a decided preference for the simplicia, save in the case of Thucydides, Plato and Deinarchus. The figures are approximately 471 simplicia, 331 parasyntheta. But why this invidious discrimination against the syntheta? We know (Curtius, Erläuterungen zu meiner griechischen Schulgrammatik, §§356–7) that simple verbs

must, if compounded at all, first be compounded with prepositions: the second stage, in proceeding to the more elaborate, synthetic form, prerequisites this intermediate formation, from which the more complicated syntheta are derived. Now, the verbalia in *-reo* are so thoroughly predicative as to be under the same restrictions, in many ways, as the verbs themselves, and hence, if compounded at all, must, *δυσ-* excepted!, be compounded with prepositions. Not so with verbals in *-tos*, which have so far lost their predicative office that they, as mere adjectives, are not held down by the verb-restrictions, and can therefore enter into many fantastic formations (cf. M. I, p. 32, vs., pp. 70 ff.). But, changing the view-point, this worrying *δυσμαχητέον* might have arisen directly from its corresponding verbal in *-tos*, even long after the consciousness of the etymology of that ending had been lost.

Before leaving the subject of the outer form of the verbal, we note that the fem. to *τέος* is *τέα*, save in the dialects, where *τέη* occurs (e. g. in Herodotus, VII 168, etc.). Naturally, the feminine forms occur least frequently of all the genders—I have counted only about 30 cases all in all; but Blass-Kühner goes too far in asserting that these verbalia *generally* appear in the neuter (Gr. II, p. 5, A. 4). Such a sweeping statement can hardly be proved even after the most exhaustive and minute examination and sifting of details. Granted with Madvig (Gr., §84, b) that "von intransitiven Verben wird das Gerundiv nur im Neutrum gebildet," yet we are perplexed at once with the case of intransitives posing as transitives by reason of having been compounded with a preposition. Deduct, moreover, all certainly fem. or masc. forms, deduct all other verbalia, which we know to be impersonal from the context, manner of expressing the agent, etc., and yet after all this there remains a bulk of ugly and desperate examples which must be conceded to be grammatical *dubia*. There is nothing, in many such cases, to *prove* whether the verbal agrees with or governs its word or construction. The verbals are incapable of receiving the comparative and superlative endings; not because, e. g., **λυττωτατος* = *maxime dignus qui*, etc., is inconceivable, but because the verbal nature, the predicate force of the adjective, is too strong for these forms to be treated as forms in *-tos* and other adjectives.

Approaching the construction and signification of these verbalia, we must refrain from the enticing attempt to classify the

delicate shadings of meaning, ranging all the way from a mere suggestion of etiquette up to the irresistible force of the logical proof. But we do urge the acceptance of the more accurate and fitting characteristic 'obligation' in place of the traditional and harsh 'necessity.' As to the matter of construction, it is established that the verbals can be used impersonally or personally: "Mais jamais l'adjectif verbal ne peut s'employer comme simple épithète, ainsi on ne pourra dire *οἱ ἐπαινετέοι ἄνδρες, τῶν ἐπαινετέων ἀνδρῶν*; il n'y en a pas d'exemples dans les auteurs" (Struve, *Opuscula*, p. 222). And yet Jelf, *Greek Grammar*, II, p. 261, §613, 4, makes the statement that the verbalia can be used as attributives, manufacturing, I suspect, the sentence *ἀσκητέα ἐστὶν ἡ ἀρετή*, or *ἡ ἀσκητέα ἀρετή*. He does not cite the passage in which this latter combination of words occurs, nor does such a passage exist in the classical literature, so far as I can detect. The only apparent exception to the universal law of the *predicative* usage of the verbalia is that, as it seems, philosophic use of the verbal with the neuter of the article, the combination being used in the abstract force: *τὰ ποιητέα*, etc., a step easily taken when the copula was (easily) omitted; and we recall the demonstrative force which was always more or less capable of reviving in the article, and *τὰ ποιητέα* = *ἐκεῖνα, ἃ ποιητέα ἐστὶν*. Cases like *Hdt. I 191, VIII 40, VIII 101, IX 60* are only apparent exceptions, the dialectic relative pronoun resembling in form the (Attic) article; but the reading in *IX 60* is disputed, if we may follow Blakesley. But it is an interesting, if not a suspicious, fact that this is the only passage in *Hdt.* in which the copula is not present with the verbal, preceded by *τὸ* = *δ*. Then our first certain case of this construction would be that Euripidean fragment, 377: *εἰδέναι τὸ δραστήον*. The fragment (24) of Chaeremon (Nauck, p. 612) does not count, as the whole passage and context is incoherent and unintelligible—even if this especial verse is properly attributed to Chaeremon after all. But once (*IV 99*) does Thucydides use the construction: *γινώσκειν τὸ ποιητέον*; Xenophon three times: *Cyrop. VIII 5, 5; Oeconom. XII 14; Rep. Lac. XIII 5* (in plural, *τὰ ποιητέα*). But I have not found one case in Plato of this 'philosophic' usage, if Struve and others are right in so styling it. True, in the fragments of the philosophers we note several examples; cf. Mullach, vol. II, p. 70 (2 cases), p. 77 (5 cases), p. 78 (1 case), p. 325 (2 cases), p. 368 (1 case). But in all the corpus oratorum I find but one instance of this construction, and that is at the same time

the only passage in all the Dekas in which the agent-dative is calmly allowed to occupy the sheltered position, Dem. VI 28. Demonstrably correct, therefore, is the statement (Struve, *Opuscula*, p. 222): "De là [he speaks of this 'philosophic' construction] à l'emploi de ces adjectifs verbaux comme épithètes il n'y a qu'un pas: mais ce pas, les auteurs de la bonne grécité ne l'ont jamais fait"; then, if true at all, which I doubt, the following statement is true only for the post-classic period: "Und die (= τὰ ποιητέα, etc.) sind dann auch in die Schriftsprache als reine adjectiva epitheta übergegangen."

Already in Sanskrit the verbal in *-ya* is met with "wie im Hauptsatz so . . . auch im Relativsatz" (Delbrück, *Altind. Synt.*, p. 379). Nor do the meagre remnants of the literature between Homer and Aeschylus afford us even a tantalizing peep into the different stages through which these forms must have passed in order, from having been practically unknown in the epos, to become felt as legitimate portions of the Greek grammatical machinery. But the feeling somehow has gone abroad that these verbalia are brought in with especial frequency in the oratio obliqua. Indeed, Anton Funck makes the statement (*Rhein. Mus.* 33, 1878) that the use of these verbalia is confined to O. O. in Thucyd. and Xenophon, being always dependent on *γυγνώσκω*, *δοκεῖν*, etc. That supposition can, I think, be proved erroneous, although the following statistics are of necessity extremely difficult of obtaining and hence to a degree unreliable, since after all the distinction between O. O. and O. R. is not infrequently subtle. In the main we can safely assert that while in the prose of the earlier period the verbalia are quite frequently introduced in O. O., yet, on the other hand, the dramatists seem to avoid just that usage, and it is in O. R. that the bulk of their cases occur. Neither Aeschylus nor Euripides gives a single case of the use of the vbl. in O. O., and in all the dramatic corpus I count only 7 instances of that usage, of which 6 are Sophoclean. My statistics make the ratio of O. R. examples to O. O. ones in the drama about 23+ : 1, an inequality met with in no other department of the literature. For the historians and philosophers I make the proportion to be about 3 : 1, which is about the norm for oratory. Herodotus' verbalia occur about half in O. O., half in O. R. Thucydides shows a decided preference for the O. O. usage—I count about 20 cases in O. O., 11 in O. R.; but these statistics require to be again adapted to the respective author's use of O. O. *vs.* O. R. quantitatively. Xen-

ophon varies: in the *Anabasis* and *Hellenika* the majority of the verbalia occur in the O. O. (about 33 to 10 is the ratio); but with a sudden change we note a strong preference for the O. R. setting in the *Mem.*, *Symp.*, *Oeconom.*, *R. L.*, *Hipparch.*, *De re equest.*, *Cyneget.*—statistics, about 101 O. R. to 20 O. O. cases. On the other hand, Plato's usage is much more uniform than Xenophon's, and the O. O. setting becomes least frequent in the longer pieces, esp. the *Republic*, *Timaeus*, *Laws*, while the spurious and doubtful pieces (*Epist.*, *Horoi*, *Demodocus*, *Sisyphos*, *Eryxias*) show a much higher number of O. O. examples than is according to the Platonic norm, which is about $4\frac{1}{2} : 1$ in favor of the O. R. setting. We expect the O. O. element to become less conspicuous in the orators, perhaps; but their normal proportion is about $2\frac{1}{2} : 1$, from which no serious deviation is to be noted: the statistics for Demosthenes, for example, are about 60 cases in O. R. as against 32 in O. O.

As between the affirmative and the negative setting, we find the great majority of these 1831 verbalia in affirmative sentences. My figures give the dramatic ratio as something like $5 : 1$, and for the historians and philosophers about the same proportion; while in oratory a sudden change appears, and the ratio seems to be something like $2\frac{1}{2} : 1$ —whether because of the greater fire, feeling, threat in the spoken appeal or no, I know not. Statistics for Demosthenes, $64 : 28$. Before leaving the subject of the negation of the verbal, we note the unhappy discovery which has made Gross very unhappy. He finds, namely (*III*, pp. 10–11), that the Attics have twice negated the vbl. with *μή*, not *οὐ*, “propter affinitatem quandam imperativi.” The one passage is Plato, *Gorgias*, p. 512 E. But certainly no new law can be based on a passage whose meaning and reading is as uncertain as is the case with the woefully annoying and much-emended passage before us. The reading adopted by C. F. Hermann, or that of Buttmann, contains no negative at all (cf. Aken, *Grundzüge der Lehre vom Tempus und Modus*, etc., §140; also Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*², §269). More difficult is the other passage, *Republic* 535 A, where *ζητητέον μή μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ* is used in a confused sort of a way, and the words are still under the half-conscious domain of the preceding *οἷον δεῖν ἐκλεκτέας εἶναι*—itself a peculiar expression with its double statement of obligation—out of which combination of the two ideas of *saying* and *necessity* the resultant notion of command most readily develops itself. But,

on the other hand, Gross seems to have overlooked Aeschines, Epist. II, 603: οὐ γὰρ, εἰ κακῶς ἔχει τὰ πράγματα, διὰ τοῦτο μὴ δὲν, ὅπως μὴ χεῖρον ἔξει, φροντιστέον, where, possibly, the object of the verbal is attracted by reason of its proximity to the ὅπως μὴ clause.

Approaching the weightier matters of construction, we are naturally confronted with the question, Which is the older of the two possible constructions of the verbal, the impersonal or the personal? The feeling obtains among some that the impersonal is the older construction. In the present condition of the literature this cannot be proved. The only pre-Aeschylean passages in which the verbal is known to us are Theognis 689, which is a grammatical dubium, and Pindar, Ol. II 6, which is impersonal. While Aeschylus furnishes one example that is certainly impersonal, Sept. 499: πείραν εὖ φυλακτέον, he uses the verbal in a certainly personal construction twice—Sept. 600: Καρπὸς οὐ κομιστέος, and Prom. vinct. 523: συγκαλυπτέος (sc. λόγος). Sophocles gives about 18 impersonalia as against 5 personalia; Euripides 43 impersonalia as against 6 personalia. Then even these few statistics point towards a gradual development into a predominance on the part of the impersonalia, while both constructions are in full vogue in the drama. In the earlier Latinity the *gerund* is used more frequently than the *gerundive*, cf. A. J. P. No. 56, p. 483 ff.; but originally the *-ndo*-forms were not passive in signification, but the rather active (Dräger, Hist. Synt. II, p. 819), or, better yet, voiceless; and Stitz has proved that even subsequently the *gerund*, so far from being always active, showed traces of its neuter, middle and even passive force (Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie, 1890, No. 8, p. 210). But the *gerundive* gains ground on the *gerund*, as we leave Plautus and Terence and come on down, and in Sallust we count 67 *gerundives* as *vs.* only 39 *gerunds* "mit direktem Objekt" (Stitz, l. l.). We do not follow the development further (cf. Dräger, l. l., p. 822; A. J. P., Whole Nos. 34 and 36), but already a parallelism begins to show itself between the gaining preference for the Latin *gerundive* and the tenacious use of the Greek personal construction, which, by the way, outlived the seemingly more favored impersonal usage, for my notes give a total of about 900 cases in which the verbal is demonstrably impersonal, as against only about 90 personal *gerundives*, thus giving a strong numerical preference for the impersonal interpretation in the case of the vexatious dubia.

But to be more specific: the personal construction occurs twice in Aeschylus, 5 times in Sophocles, 6 times (only) in Euripides—

summa tragica = 13. Aristophanes uses the personal construction 6 times. Herodotus gives us 4 examples; Thucydides, 4; Xenophon, 15; Plato, 41; fragmenta hist. et orat., 2; total = 66. Of the orators, Antiphon furnishes 2 examples; Isocrates, 3; Dem., 7; total = 12. Then the total of all cases in which the grammatical context proves the verbal to be indisputably personal we infer to be 97, if the statistics are accurate. Thus Plato uses the personal construction most frequently of the prose-writers, 41 cases in 2442 T. pages, i. e. about 1 : 60; Herodotus least frequently, 4 cases in 799 T. pages, i. e. about 1 : 200. Only 3 of the Dekas use it at all, hence it finds its sphere not in Oratory, nor in Herodotus, the non-Attic, nor in Thucydides, the Attic historian. Sophocles' slightly higher ratio of usage may not be especially significant, nor the fact that he always places the personal verbal at the end of the line. Its real sphere seems to be the colloquial one, e. g. Plato's Dialogues, Xenophon, when not too strict and historical; there are only 2 instances of it in the Anab., and one of these is doubtful; there is no case in the Hellenika; the ratio gets very high in the Mem. (1 : 35½ pages), quite low in Plato's Laws (1 : 140 pages), at its highest (in Plato) in the Republic (!), 1 : 14. Furthermore, of Demosthenes' 7 cases three occur in one speech (24), and of those three, two are in one and the same clause, the one a negative antithesis of the other. Isocrates wandered off into the only case of the verbal being used in the gen. absolute in the classic period; his other two verbalia occur in the same paragraph of the Παναθηναϊκός.

Then these verbalia are all passives, and derived from verbs which are, or should be, transitives, however subtle the distinction between Homer's βαίνω διὰ + acc. and διαβαίνω + acc. By the way, Krüger (Sprachlehre, §56, 18, a. 1) uses the example βασιλευρία ἡ πόλις—the gerund βασιλευρία does not occur in classic Greek! But what is the great distinction in signification between the personal and impersonal constructions? We at once meet the 'rule' thus formulated by some grammarians: When the personal construction is used, the emphasis falls on the subject of the act; when the impersonal, on the act itself. Not only grammars, but even so neat a worker as Kopetsch (p. 28) hands down this tradition: "videntur apud Platonem verbo εἶναι tantum iuncta esse, ita quidem, ut, si in subiecto, quod vocant, vis est sita, hoc sequantur et genere et numero, contra si in actione, in neutro genere, et singularis quidem fere semper." But that law does not really

obtain. Already Schülze (p. 10) uses the following words: "sed hanc legem in oratores Atticos non valere Karlowa (Bemerkungen zum Sprachgebrauch des Demosthenes, etc., pp. 13-14) luculenter ostendit." Before seeing Karlowa's Programm I had disproved the validity of this 'law' relatively to other authors; indeed, it is mechanical as well as false; moreover, the real stress rests often on neither verb nor subject, but on other words in the sentence, e. g. inner accus., adverb, agent-expression, etc. Cases in which that 'rule' cannot obtain are, e. g. Dem. 24, 78; 54, 44; 21, 142; 22, 62; Aeschines 1, 138; Isocrates 12, 233. In Herodotus, IX 58 the two constructions occur side by side, with logical subjects identical, and there is no more emphasis on the subject in the one clause than in the other. A clue to the true interpretation might be suspected to lie in the following circumstance. The first clause is a negative, *ἐκείνοισι ταῦτα ποιεῦσι οὐκ ἐπιτρεπτέα εἶναι*: the temporarily entertained conception is immediately rejected by the negative, hence the undesirability of the personal construction, which tends to emphasize duration, because characteristic, adjectival. Just that fact makes the personal construction desirable in the second clause, an affirmative one: *ἀλλὰ διωκτέοι εἶσιν*. Again that mechanical distinction fails in Hdt. III 127, where the *manner* of Orestes' death is 'emphasized'; fails in Xen., Mem. III 10, 8; in Xen., Cyropaed. II, II 23; ib. VII, V 7; Oecon. XIX 9; Symp. VIII 20; Plato, Gorgias 508 a; the construction got twisted in Phaedo 107 B, the intervening conditional causing the grammatical consecutio to shift from the impersonal to the personal usage. The 'law' fails in Plato, Rep. 403 C; ib. 561 C; Epist. 342 A; Aeschylus, Prom. 523; Soph., O. C. 883; Ajax 679; Eur., Orest. 484; Aristoph., Ach. 221; Ran. 633—these are some of the more conspicuous of the cases, selected at random. My own conception of the nature of the personal construction was just about that which Karlowa has formulated in the following words: "Da nun bei der unpersönlichen Konstruktion das Verbaladjektiv als Verbum, bei der persönlichen als Adjektivum behandelt wird, so lässt sich schliessen, dass die persönliche Konstruktion nur da angewandt wird, wo eine *Eigenschaft beigelegt wird*." Then if we wish to express an abiding quality, a characteristic, the gerundive is the construction to use, in the first instance, and the Schol. to Aeschylus, Sept. 600, paraphrases *οὐ κομιστέος* by *οὐκ ἄξιος κομίζεσθαι*. But the full and wide distinction between personal and impersonal construction—

their exact spheres—we will attempt to formulate more accurately below. Karlowa's statement needs both restriction and enlargement, to say nothing of that other fact, viz. that questions of style, attractions, 'Wortlaut,' etc., not infrequently cause sudden and seemingly unnecessary changes from the one construction to the other; e. g. Xen., Mem. III, X 8; Plato, Protag. 356 C; Rep. 535 A, 373 B.

Before leaving the subject of the personal construction, we note an interesting fact connected with the agent-expression of these personalia. While the agent is more commonly not expressed at all with the gerundives, yet when expressed it is always in the dative, never the accusative. Out of the sum-total of 97 gerundives, only 27 (with a possible addition of 2 more doubtful cases in Thucydides) are associated with their agent-cases—always datives. And why "always datives"? Not because of the following explanation (I cite from Gross, III, p. 10): "Quod gerundiva nunquam cum accusativo personae coniuncta videmus, id non casui tribuendum sed eam ob causam certissimam factum arbitror, quod gerundiva, quum in adiectivarum familiam se contulissent, simul etiam naturam illam verbis δειν et χρῆναι similem exuerunt." Others many have said the like, only from a different point of view. Then, in cases where reasons and exigencies of style necessitate a sudden shift from the impersonal to the personal construction, immediately and always we must see a corresponding difference in the organic sense of the two verbalia—connected, as they sometimes are, with the same subject? This semasiological gymnastic feat is certainly *not* necessary. The proper state of the case, as I think it, will be given below. Suffice it to say here that the verb-force of the gerundive is not strong enough to command an agent-accusative. Of that anon.

Impersonalia.—As we saw above, the facts do not warrant us in accepting the theory of some, that the impersonal construction is the older of the two—the 'original' one ("Originairement, cet adjectif verbal, pris impersonnellement, eut la signification active," etc., Struve, l. l.). We saw that the impersonal construction was through the whole of the classical period much the more frequently used; but for all that the personal usage appeared with a tenacious regularity all through the classical time, and in fact has actually outlived the more favored impersonal construction,

and I have the statement of a scholarly gentleman in Greece, a Ph. D. of the University of Athens, to the effect that the impersonal construction is, in Modern Greek, dead, while the personal use lives yet, and the verbal is actually allowed to stand in the sheltered position.

The gerund (impersonally used verbal) can be used either *absolutely*, i. e. not 'governing' any case, or in a transitive sense, controlling the construction of a word or words in the sentence. In the first construction we have verbs which are incapable of 'governing' case, or else those whose possible cases are omitted. More interesting are the other cases, those in which the verbal 'governs' its case, generally a genitive. According to my statistics the classic literature from Homer to Aristotle furnishes 1076 cases in which the verbalia are used impersonally; of this number 34 are in the plural, the remaining 1042 in the singular, none in the dual. Now, of these 1076, 645 'govern' cases directly, and the study of those passages is interesting indeed. We note a gradual development out of the earlier, free usage, into the later fixity. That development does not so much affect the use of the genitive as versus the dative case, for there shows itself little or no preference in that matter. I count 77 cases of the genitive, 67 of the dative. More interesting is the matter of the use of the accusative as versus the absolute, neuter use of the verbal. The 'governed' accus. seems to be expressed 501 times, while the verbal appears without accusative 321 times, though we include in this latter list many cases in which the accusative is actually mentioned in the context, but for various reasons of style, etc., is not repeated in direct connection with the verbal—I roughly count about 60 such passages. Now, in the earlier writers the preference is to use the verbal absolutely, rather than with its expressed accusative-object. So in the drama, so in history up to Xenophon; in this period I count 35 cases of the expressed accusative-object as against 68 cases of the verbal used absolutely. Sophocles admits the accusative only twice, though using the verbal absolutely 12 times—freer in the admission of the oblique case are Euripides and Aristophanes;—we count 18 and 10 accusatives respectively, as against 19 and 23 cases of the absolute verbal. Suddenly the accusative construction becomes popular—with Xenophon—and remains so: Xenophon expresses the accusative 63 times, using the verbal absolutely 29 times; Plato, 302 accusatives, 175 absolute; Philosophorum fragmenta,

acc. 32, abs. 17; Isocrates, acc. 28, abs. 9; Demosthenes, acc. 25, abs. 13. The verb-power of the verbal has grown, and hence the accusative-object is expressed more freely. Then the uncertainty and fluctuation of the earlier period betrays an experimenting spirit, would seem to indicate that the gerund construction was not at that time old enough to have attained its ultimate fixity; that it originated, possibly, between Homer and Pindar, and perchance nearer to Pindar than to Homer. Of the verbals referred to above as used absolutely, not a few are, as a matter of fact, followed by prepositions with their cases. Of those prepositions *περί* is the favorite, occurring 27 times; *ἐπί* comes next, 21 times; then *εἰς*, 19 times; *πρός*, 14 times; *ἀπό*, 10 times; and *ὑπέρ*, 8 times; the rest (*παρά*, *διά*, *πρό*, etc.) occurring from 1 to 3 times each.

As stated above, the genitive occurs somewhat more frequently than the dative, in direct dependence on the gerund. I count about 75 such instances. The most frequently recurring verbal is *ἐπιμελητέον*, introduced by Xenophon, occurring chiefly in Xen. and the philosophers, and appearing with its gen. about 12 times in all; *μελητέον* and *ἀμελητέον* occur each once. 8 times the gen. depends on *ἀφεκτέον*, 4 times on *ἐκτέον* and its other compounds; but often the substitution of a *τι* or the like, on which after all the gen. might depend, lies dangerously near. The verbs of hearing—*ἀκουστέον* 6 times, *ἀκροατέον* once—also occur; *ἀπτεόν* has its gen. 5 times; *ἀποστατέον*, 4 times; *ἀρκτέον* and *ἀντιληπτέον* each 3 times; *ἡσσητέα*, *μεταδοτέον*, *κατηγορητέον*, *ἀπαλλακτέον*, *κοινωνητέον* each twice, while the list closes with the following *semel inventa*: *ἀπαρυστέον*, *ὑφελκτέον*, *προοπτέον*, *ἡγητέον*, *καταψηφιστέον*, *ἀποτμητέον*, *γενεστέον*, *ἀποδεκτέον*, *διανοητέον* (very doubtful), *ἀπολαυστέον*, *ὀλιγωρητέον*, *ὑπεροπτέον*, *ἀποπειρατέον*, *φειστέον*, *παυστέον*, *ληκτέον*. Then all of these are what we might call natural, as distinguished from artificial genitives, if our constructions are in each case correct.

I count about 66 cases of the gerund 'governing' the dative. Again, Xenophon seems to have introduced the most commonly recurring of these verbals—*χρηστέον*, occurring 17 times; Euripides already uses the next most frequently recurring one, *πειστέον*, 12 cases, while all others are used much less frequently; e. g. 4 cases of *πιστευτέον*; 3 each of *δουλευτέον*, *ἐπιστατητέον*, *προσεκτέον*; 2 each of *βοηθητέον*, *παραχωρητέον*, *ἐπιθετέον*, *χαριστέον*, *ἀθυμητέον*, *ὁμονοητέον*. Again the list closes with the *semel inventa* *ἄμυντέα*, *δυσμαχητέον*, *ἐπιτρεπτέα*, *συνεστέον*, *ἀποκριτέον*, *προσχηρητέον*, *συγχωρητέα*, *θαρη-*

τέον, ἀκολουθητέον, συμβουλευτέον, ἐπακολουθητέον, στερκτέον. Thucydides is no lover of these oblique-case constructions, using the gen. only 3 times, the dat. never; nor does Euripides use the gen. but once, the dat. 3 times with his 44 gerunds. But in the majority, at least, of those cases the gerund construction was a necessity. The voluntary and conspicuous choice and preference for the gerund construction appears first in the following passages, in which the personal construction was possible, the accusative of the active (gerund) becoming the nom. of the passive (gerundive).

But before we go over to the more minute examination of the impersonalia which are associated with the accusative alone, those verbalia will be noticed which display a twofold 'governing' capacity, being associated with the gen. or dat. in addition to the accus. There are only about a dozen such verbals, but it would defy the skill of the most astute, sometimes, to tell whether or no a given dative or genitive depends on the verb-force of the verbal, and not on some subtle noun or pronoun that can easily be supplied, and hence is not expressed in the context; in other words, when a dative "depends on the verb," and when it is the dative of the complex. It may be well to look at a few of these passages. The verbal is always in the sg. (-τέον) when associated with the accusative, though both sg. and pl. occur (-τέον and -τέα), when that verbal is accompanied by its other case. Twice the verbal in -τέα is associated with the dative, three times with the genitive. ἐπιτρεπτέον occurs twice (Hdt. IX 58; Plat., Symp. 213 E) with the dative, 4 times with the accusative (Pl., Protag. 313 B; Anterastai 138 E; Laws 876 A, ib. 876 D). With the dat. it means 'to allow,' and once (Hdt. IX 58) is accompanied by a participle. Such rudimentary construction-dependencies begin to appear not infrequently in these passages. With the direct object the sense of the vbl. is 'to entrust,' and it is always accompanied by its remoter dat., with the sole exception of Plat., Laws 876 D, since the second ἐπιτρεπτέον in Laws 876 A does not count. ἐπιθετέον occurs but once governing an accus. (Plato, Gorg. 507 D), and there it shows the middle force, "auf sich nehmen"; with the dative it occurs twice (Pl., Symp. 217 C; Plat., Soph. 231 C), but these datives are really indirect objects: "eum adoriamur oportet." ἀποκριτέον with the accus. (Pl., Rep. 413 D; ib. 414 A) means 'to reject,' 'discard.' Only once (Plat., Hipp. mai. 288 D) does it seem to be associated with a dative, and that dative is an ind. object. συγχωρητέον occurs once (Pl.,

Soph. 249 B) with an accusative; but there we have really a sentence-dependency: τὸ κινούμενον δὴ καὶ κίνησιν συγχωρητέον ὡς ὄντα. Its dat. occurs but once, Pl., Leg. 895 A, where L. and S. are unhappy in giving it the sense of 'to concede'; it means 'to accede, assent to.' προσεκτέον has its accus. τὸν νοῦν expressed in 3 passages—Pl., Menon 96 D; Isoc., Ep. 2, 17; Isoc., Ep. 7, 7;—when the acc. is omitted we have the three datives—Pl., Demod. 384 E Aeschines, I 119; Dinarch. I 112, in which latter passage, by the way, the remarkable *consecutio verborum* occurs: οὐ προσεκτέον ὑμῖν ἐστὶ τοῖς τούτων λόγοις εἰδότας, etc. ἀκουστέον always has the gen., except in the one passage Pl., Rep. 386 A, where the acc. occurs in the artificial circumlocution τὰ περὶ θεοῦς. In 3 of the remaining 6 cases it means 'to obey' (Soph., El. 340; Eur., Iph. Aul. 1010; Herod. III 61); in the other 3, 'to hear' (Ar., Ran. 1180; Xen., Symp. III 9; Philos. fragt., vol. I, p. 448). But Schöll suspects the whole context of Soph., El. 340 of being spurious. ἐκτέον governs the accus. in 5 cases (Xen., Mem. III 11, 2; Pl., Anterastai 138 E; Rep. 468 A, *ibid.* 535 B; Dem. LVIII 60) as against one passage (Xen., Hell. VI 1, 13) in which it shows the middle force of the verb. Twice the accusative occurs after ἀποδεκτέον (Xen., Oecon. VII 36; Pl., Leg. 668 A). In the remaining two passages in which it seems to directly govern a case (Pl., Phaedrus 272 B; Rep. 379 C) we see the subtle development of the sentence-dependencies. In the latter passage the verbal is associated with the name of a person, and it in turn is accompanied by a participle: ἀποδεκτέον . . . Ὁμήρον . . . ἀμαρτάνοντος καὶ λέγοντος, etc. We look upon this as a not yet fully developed sentence-dependency. But in the Theaetet. 160 C the genitive, ἄλλου λέγοντος, does not depend on the verbal, but is an absolute; hence it is unnecessary (with L. and S.) to ache over the rarity of the construction of ἀποδεκτέον + gen. of thing + part., as it *appears* to occur in the Phaedrus 272 B, where the participle, λεγομένης, is *attributive*. Both the grammatical difficulties attending this construction, as also the uncertainty of the reading in Pl., Laws 646 D, make it desirable not to include διανοητέον amongst those verbalia which control the double construction; cf. Stallbaum *ad loc.*

Once πανστέον shows the middle force in Demosthenes (X 76), being followed by the gen. pl.; it is accompanied by the accusative in the remaining three cases: Plat., Gorg. 523 D; Plat., Rep. 391 E; Isoc. XV 175. But, after all, it is often a matter of

subjective decision—or a matter of taste?—whether we interpret the accompanying participle as attributive or predicative, and therefore practically equivalent to a sentence-dependency. At any rate, the causal interpretation of the participle is not to be rejected too hastily.

Proceeding to the verbalia which are associated with the accusative alone, we take up *first* those instances in which the verbal appears associated with a simple direct accusative; *secondly*, those which show the double accusative; *thirdly*, the verbal followed by its rudimentary sentence-dependencies developed out of the double accusative.

I. Transitive verbal followed by the simple, direct accusative-object.—The first example of this construction is Pindar, Ol. II 6: *θήρωνα . . . γεγωνητέον*. The next appearance of the construction is the one example in Aeschylus, Sept. 499. After Sophocles, who gives us two instances of it, the construction is quite common. I seem to have counted 369 examples of this simple construction in our period, excluding, so far as that can be certainly done, all inner accusatives, double accusatives, etc. The object of the verbal in the example in Pindar was a person; in Aeschylus, a thing; of Sophocles' two, one was a person, one a thing. After this the preference for thing-objects develops—not very strong at first, as the ratio for the tragedians is about 1 : 2. But Aristophanes shows a decided preference for thing-objects, while Xen. reverts to the (approximate) tragic norm, but at times so far overruns it as to give a total of 20 person- to 25 thing-accusatives. But with Plato the decided preference for thing-accusatives returns, and even the increase in person-accusatives in the Republic—chiefly in the Third Book—barely serves to raise the general proportion above the tragic norm. The use in the *Fragmenta philosophorum* corresponds about to that of Plato, while the orators show something of Xenophon's liking for person-accusatives, the ratio rising to something like 1 : 3. As stated above, the total number of examples of this construction we give to be 369; of these 290 are thing-accusatives, 79 persons. The person, as it were, resists the (weaker) verb-force of the verbal; not so the lifeless thing, over which the verbal easily exerts its power. The verbal itself, thus used, is always in the sg., save in Thucyd. I 86, 3 (*παραδοτέα*), Ar., Plut. 1085 (*συνεκποτέα*), and Plato, Rep. 317 B (*ἀποβλητέα*). Of course, all these verbalia are derived from transitive verbs; e. g. *φυλακτέον*, *ἀνοικτέον*, *κακιστέον*, *νικητέον*, *τολμητέον*, *ἐκδοτέον*, etc.

But already in Eur., Suppl. 291 the acc. of the inner object begins to dispute the field with our 'direct object,' and one may well hesitate before 'parsing' the acc. in στενακτέον τὰ τούτων, and yet not be a heretic; nor is it news to any one that countless passages occur whose accusatives fall on the border-line between what we call 'direct object' and acc. of inner object. Delbrück defines the object as the "Gegenstand der von der Handlung des Verbums unmittelbar betroffen wird," and it is a deliverance to be able to avoid the expression 'transitive verb.' He continues: "Der Akkusativ des Resultats ist . . . wenn man seine Entstehung in betracht zieht, von dem Akk. des Inhalts nicht zu trennen. Der fertige Akkusativ des Resultats aber steht dem des Objekts am nächsten. Denn schwerlich empfindet der Sprechende einen Unterschied zwischen 'ein Haus bauen (Resultat), und 'ein Haus einreissen' (Objekt)." The inner accusative is no scarcity after these impersonal verbalia: examples like Xen., Anab. II, II 12 (πορευτέον . . . σταθμούς); Pl., Gorg. 500 D (βιωτέον . . . ὁπότερον, sc. βίον); Pl., Rep. 467 B (κινδυνευτέον . . . τι); Pl., Rep. 504 D (περιτέον . . . μακροτέραν); Ar., Equit. 72 (τρεπτέον . . . ὁδόν); and Soph., Phil. 994 (πειστέον . . . τάδε) explain themselves. Genuine cognate accusatives are, e. g., μηχανητέον . . . μηχανήν (Pl., Legg. 798 E) and προαγωνιστέον . . . προαγῶνας (Pl., Laws 796 D). The simple accusative of the result of the object effected by the action of the verb is not so common here as are the inner object and the cognate accusative. Instances of the former are, e. g., Ar., Eq. 72; Xen., Anab. II, II 12; Plat., Gorg. 500 D; Pl., Soph. 257 A; Rep. 467 B, ibid. 504 D; Kritias 108 D; Soph., Phil. 994. Instances of the latter construction are Pl., Legg. 798 E, 796 D, etc. But the sphere widens as we approach those cases in which the object of the verbal is the proleptic subject of the dependent clause; such cases are, e. g., Xen., Mem. II, VI 8; Pl., Soph. 260 E, ib. 230 D; Pl., Politicus 260 C, ib. 306 A; Alc. II 140 D; Rep. 421 E (?), ib. 555 B, ib. 502 D; Philebus 33 C, ib. 23 A; Eur., Hel. 85; Xen., Mem. II, VI 8. In these cases there is only a grammatical difference between a dubium and a certainly impersonal gerund. Less interesting are the cases in which the verbal's direct object or object affected is followed by a prepositional phrase; e. g. Xen., Mem. IV, II 15; Cyrop. I 6, 31; Frag. histor. II, p. 167 (?); Pl., Rep. 540 A, ib. 537 C; Frag. phil. I, p. 556; Dem. XXIX 36, ib. LVIII 60; Eur., Elect. 491, etc.

II. Verbal followed by the *double accusative*.—Delbrück distinguishes three classes of double accusatives: 1°. Cases in which the one accusative is a predicate; 2°. The one accus. stands nearer to the verb than the other does; 3°. The verb's action affects α) a person and a thing, or β) a whole in one of its parts. To begin at the end, I have only one case of 3 β), viz. Plato, Timaeus 67 E: αὐτὰ προσρητέον, τὸ μὲν . . . τὸ δ' ἐναντίον, etc., and this might be classed under 1°. Scarcely more popular was 3 α), of which my lists show only two examples: Xen., Hell. VI 3, 7: διδασκτέον ἀλλήλους τὰ αἷτια κ. τ. λ.; Plato, Rep. 451 E: ταῦτα καὶ διδασκτέον αὐτάς. Similarly of construction 2° I count only five cases, nor are all of those free from some sort of suspicion: the loci are Xen., Cyrop. VII, I 11; Mem. I, VII 2; de re eq. X 11; Plat., Epinom. 983 E (?), and Euthydemus 273 C. Then the great bulk of our examples of the double accusative fall under the first head. We might roughly divide these (forty) cases into α) those which *do not*, β) those which *do* imply the idea of *saying, thinking*, etc. But it is often a treacherous line of demarkation between rudimentary O. O. and full-fledged O. O. Plato abounds in cases of θετέον, e. g. Laws 867 A, 654 B; Soph. 235 A, etc., and we cannot possibly tell just when a worrisome εἶναι lies concealed just below the surface. The second class is introduced by, if not fully represented in such verbals as κλητέον, ἡγητέον, λεκτέον, φατέον, προσρητέον, ξυγχωρητέον, ἐπονομαστέον, νομοθετητέον, etc. Then, if such cases are certainly impersonalia, does it not follow that the O. O. dependencies always make their verbalia impersonal? As examples of the fairly clear double acc. we might cite the following, chosen at random from the large number on my lists: Xen., Mem. IV, X 8; Plat., Cratyl. 393 C; Laws 867 A; Rep. 545 B; Phileb. 15 B, 56 D; Timaeus 79 D, etc.; Frg. phil. I, p. 492; II, p. 55; Dem. XXXIX 35, XXIII 74. But just as the construction of the double accus. can be abbreviated or mutilated by omissions, etc., so there is sometimes an extension of the mode of expression, and we suspect beginnings of sentence-dependencies. θετέον αὐτὸν στρατηγὸν does not differ materially from θετέον αὐτὸν τέχνην ἔχοντα (Pl., Soph. 221 D). Other superadded participles appear in Pl., Soph. 255 D, 249 B (part. + ὥς); Politicus 293 E; Philebus 37 E; Isoc. XII 96. More difficult of exact analysis is the participle in Pl., Gorg. 523 D: πανστέον . . . προειδόμενος αὐτοὺς τὸν θάνατον. Bolder yet are the infinitives; e. g. Isoc. IX 7: τοὺς δ' ἄλλους ἐθιστέον ἀκούειν—is this acc. of inner obj.? So ὥς+indic. is admitted in

Pl., Soph. 230 D; *ὥς* + inf., Dem. XX 154: *τοὺς νόμους σπουδαστέον ὥς κάλλιστ' ἔχειν*, where we have prolepsis of the subject of dependent clause. Difficult is Pl., Philebus 61 A; if *μείον* is acc. of measure in Xen., Apol. 26, is not *περὶ πολλοῦ* a (logical) accus. in sentences like Plat., Rep. 389 B: *ἀλήθειάν γε περὶ πολλοῦ ποιητέον*? Then comes *μέγα φρονητέον* + *ἐπί* + dat.; cf. Xen., Hell. II 4, 40; II 4, 41. *ἀποδεκτέον* is followed by the acc. sg. + gen. sg. + part. in Pl., Rep. 379 C; *αἰτιατέον* is followed by acc. sg. + gen. of inf. in Pl., Timaeus 57 C. So *προσλογιστέα* is followed by acc. + dat. (both of things) in Hdt. VII 185; *πειστέον* + dat. + acc. pl., Pl., Rep. 365 E; *κοινωνητέον* + gen. + dat., Pl., Rep. 403 B; *αἰτιατέον* + acc. pers. + gen. rei, Pl., Timaeus 87 B; *προτιμητέον* + acc. + gen., Pl., Laws 726; *εἰατέον* + acc. + gen., Pl., Laws 969 C; *αἰτιατέον* + acc. + gen., Dem. X 76; *προαιρετέον* + acc. + gen., Dem. VI 5. Which is agent in Isoc. IX 7, *δουλευτέον* + acc. + dat.? 'Απολυτέον is followed by acc. + gen. in Frgt. Oratorum, p. 132. In Xen., Cyropaed. I 6, 9, *ἀγωνιστέον* is followed by *ἄ* + *πρός* + acc.; the prepositional phrase is equal to a second acc. *Αἰτιατέον* + acc. + gen. occurs in Pl., Rep. 379 C. Ast and L. & S. differ in construing *ἀπεικαστέον* + acc. + dat. in Pl., Phaedrus 270 E. *προσοιστέον* is followed by acc. + dat. in Pl., Phaedrus 272 A.

CHARLES EDWARD BISHOP.

II.—PROVERBS AND TALES COMMON TO THE TWO SANSKRIT EPICS.

In the long chapter on the duties of kings, of which I spoke in my last paper, there is a proverb which appears in Gorresio's text, ii. 109. 58, in the form

*yāni mithyābhiṣastānāṁ patanty aṣrūṇi rodātām
tāni putra paṣūn ghnanti teṣāṁ mithyābhiṣaṁsinām,*

that is: "The tears of them who weep on being falsely accused destroy, my son, the cattle of them who falsely accuse." The corresponding portion of the section in the Mahābhārata has no such proverb, but the alternate text of the Rāmāyaṇa not only has the proverb but, as it were, fits it more snugly into its present place by reading *Rāghava* at the end of the first line. Turning now to an entirely different part of the Mahābhārata we find the original, or the nearest approach to the original that we are likely to discover. In this older and freer form the proverb has no vocative at all, and indeed the particular vocative *putra* in the Rāmāyaṇa is suspicious enough in itself, as Rāma generally addresses Bharata either with *tāta* or by name or title. The fact that the proverb is outside of the *kaccit* interrogatives and that it is an independent verse in the Mahābhārata without any form of address shows us pretty plainly what has happened. In the first place, one of the countless floating proverbs of the age is caught up and preserved in Mbh. xii. 91. 20 in an impersonal form: "The tears of them who weep on being falsely accused destroy the sons and cattle of those (accusers) in consequence of the false accusation."¹ The *kaccit* chapter of the Mahābhārata has not yet taken up this bit of wisdom, but the Rāmāyaṇa first adopts it by changing *putrān* to *putra*, and then the secondary text, which, as I showed in my last paper, is in this instance the Bombay version, adopts it still further by altering *rodātām* to *Rāghava*; so that in the end the verse has quite the appearance of being at home, when

¹ For *putra* of R. C. and B., M. has *putrān*; for B.'s genitive, M. has the abl. *mithyābhiṣaṁsināt*, while R. C. reads *pratyartham anuṣṣataḥ*.

we hear Rāma cite it in his usual patronizing way, beginning: "Yes, Rāghava, my boy, the tears," etc.

Just as the phraseology of both epics is in great part identical, so also the proverbial substratum is, as we should expect, more or less the same, and there cannot be much doubt that both epics drew on the same material, besides adding each to its own store. A favorite method of doing this is to take up the original proverb and then repeat it in a different form, modifying it somewhat in each new casting. A review of the proverbs common to both epics forms a sort of corollary to a review of the phraseology, and in some cases it is actually difficult to say whether we are handling the wreck of a proverb or merely an identical *pāda*-phrase.

There are, of course, in the Rāmāyaṇa, as in the Mahābhārata, many proverbs which appear first again in much later literature and not at all in the other epic. Such, for example, is the *lokapravāda* cited B. iii. 59. 16: "He that is about to die smells not the smell of an expiring lamp (*dīpanirvāṇa*), hears not a friend's words, and sees not the star Arundhatī." This turns up in the Hitopadeśa, but appears to be as yet unknown to the Mahābhārata. But even the introductory phrase *loka-pravāda*, instead of the simpler term employed in the Mahābhārata, points to a later stage.¹

One of these proverbs akin to the last embodies the oft-repeated warning against "seeing golden trees," which seems to be a special application of the more general proverb known to classical antiquity as *quos deus perdere vult dementat prius*. The relation of the two epics to these proverbs is not without interest. At the meeting of the Oriental Society in Baltimore, in October, 1887, I pointed out the extraordinary verbal resemblance of the Greek, Latin and Sanskrit proverbs, as the last is found in the Mahābhārata, ii. 81. 8 and v. 34. 81, where the wording is:

*yasmāi devāḥ prayacchanti puruṣāya parābhavam
buddhiṃ tasyā 'pakarṣanti so 'vācīnāni paçyati,*

"For whatsoever man the gods prepare the overthrow, they take away his senses, and he sees things inverted." This is evidently, however, the same proverb with that which appears in the Rāmāyaṇa, iii. 56. 16; B. iii. 62. 20-21:

¹ The word *gāthā* is also used for a proverbial stanza. Thus in R. B. vi. 110. 2: *pāurāṇī cāi 'va gāthe 'yam lāukiki pratibhāti me, eti jīvantam ānando naraṇ varṣaṭād api*. C. reads *kalyāṇa bata*.

*yadā vināṣakālo vāi lakṣyate dāivanirmītaḥ
tadā vāi viparīteṣu manāḥ prakurute naraḥ,*

"When the time of destruction ordained by Fate is remarked, then the man sets his mind on things inverted." Here *viparīta* is synonymous with *avācīna*. It is this former word which the Mahābhārata itself employs in the proverb of the golden trees, vi. 98. 17:

*mumūrṣur hi naraḥ sarvān vṛkṣān paśyati kāñcanān
tathā tvam api Gāndhāre viparītāni paśyasi,*

"The man that is about to die forsooth sees golden trees; so thou too, Gāndhāri, seest inverted," i. e. incorrectly. This is further explained by the preceding verse: "Through thy confusion of mind, *mohāt*, thou knowest not what should be said and should not be said." Thus when this proverb appears by inference in the Rāmāyaṇa, we read C. iii. 53. 17-19:

17. *mṛtyukāle yathā martyo viparītāni sevate*

mumūrṣūṇāṃ tu sarveṣāṃ yat paṭhyaṃ tan na rocate

19. *vyaktaṃ hiraṇmayāṃ tvaṃ hi saṃpaśyasi mahīruhān*

(B. 59. 19: *nūnaṃ hiraṇmayān mohāt tvaṃ paśyasi mahīruhān*),

"As at the time of death a mortal observes things inverted, but nothing that is suitable pleases any that are about to die; so thou forsooth plainly seest golden trees." The vision of golden trees is then a special form of the general 'inverted' or crooked sight which presages death. This allusion to the golden vision is as common in the Rāmāyaṇa as it is rare in the Mahābhārata. The former epic has many passages implying it. Thus in R. C. iii. 68. 11:

uparudhyanti me prāṇā dṛṣṭir bhramati Rāghava

paśyāmi vṛkṣān sāuvarṇān Uçīrakṛtamūrdhajān

(B. 73. 15: *paśyāmi vṛkṣān etāñ ca sāuvarṇān iva sāmpratam*),

"My life-breath fails, my sight wanders, Rāghava; I see the golden trees of death" ("now I see those trees which, as it were, are golden"); which last, as the scholiast says, is the *marāṇa-cihnam* or 'sign of death.' Again, to connote the last extreme of folly, "Now, foolish one, thou seest many a golden tree."¹

¹ R. B. iii. 53. 47: *pādopān kāñcanān nūnaṃ bahūn paśyasi durmate* (C. *man-dabhāk*). Compare also the description in R. B. iv. 41. 47: *jātarūpamayāir vṛkṣāiḥ puṣpitāiḥ pariṣobhitam martukāmā narāḥ pūrvān taṃ paśyanti mahā-*

But to leave these vaguer resemblances, there is enough of striking parallelism in the field of proverbs to merit attention. Themes of life, death and fate are favorites to the epic moralists, and it is not surprising that we should find the two poems touch each other here most closely. The first example I shall cite shows how (as in the *kaccit* chapter¹ Bharatarṣabha and Kākeyīsuta interchange) the proverb is adapted to the particular epic in which it is embalmed. Thus M.² xi. 2. 23:

na kālasya priyaḥ kañcin na dveṣyaḥ, Kurusattama,

"Fate loves no one and hates no one, thou best of Kurus," compared with R. B. iv. 18. 28:

na kālasya priyaḥ kañcin na dveṣyo 'sti, Kapiṣvara,

"Fate loves no one and hates no one, thou lord of apes." The following remarks on the same subject (M. *kālaḥ pacati*, etc.) differ in each epic,³ and in both the theme is often touched upon elsewhere. Compare, for example, R. B. vi. 8. 16: *pacaty eva yathā kālaḥ*; and M. xii. 229. 94: *na jātva akāle*, etc. One of these fatalistic proverbs, called in the Rāmāyaṇa a "*lokapravāda* of the Pundits," is evidently at bottom the same with another in the Mahābhārata. Thus in R. v. 25. 12:

*lokapravādo satyo 'yaṁ paṇḍitāiḥ samudāhṛtaḥ
akāle durlabho mṛtyuḥ striyā vā puruṣasya vā,*

"True is the Pundits' proverb: Death is not easy to attain till one's time comes," which in B. 28. 3 is repeated in the form

satyaṁ vaco yat pravadanti viprā nā 'kālamṛtyur bhavati 'ha loke,

"True is the word the priests declare: No death untimely (i. e. at an hour not fated) happens here among men." This is nothing but a restatement of M. xii. 25. 11 and xiii. 164. 10:

dharam, jātārūpamayāns tāñ ca vividhāns tatra pādapān, Uçtravījo yāir juṣṭo Yamasyo 'ttaraparvataḥ. The banana, which is sometimes called golden and is typical of death and decay, may have served as the starting-point of the metaphor. Compare R. C. vi. 61. 25: *pravṛddhaḥ kāñcano vṛkṣaḥ phalakūle nikṛntyate* (B. *na kṛtvā . . . nipātyate*).

¹ R. C. ii. 100. 27 and M. ii. 5. 44. A. J. P. XIX, p. 149.

² In this paper M. stands for Mahābhārata and R. (alone) for Rāmāyaṇa, Bombay edition (or expressly C.), as opposed to B., that is Gorresio's text.

They are indicated in Böhtlingk's *Spruch* 3194.

*nā 'kālatō mriyate jāyate vā ; and
nā 'prāptakālo mriyate (viddhaḥ),*

"Not untimely one dies or is born ; (even though wounded with an hundred arrows) one dies not if his time has not come." The phrase *duratīkramāḥ kālāḥ*, in Purāṇa and Rāmāyaṇa alike, sums it all up ; for example, R. iii. 68. 21 = B. 73. 26 :

so 'yam adya hataḥ ṣete kālo hi duratīkramāḥ,

"So here to-day he lies destroyed ; for the fated hour is hard to overcome." The same idea is expressed in the Mahābhārata, xiv. 53. 16 :

na diṣṭam abhyatīkrāntuṁ śakyaṁ buddhyā balena vā,

"Neither by intelligence nor by power can one overcome what is appointed." And the two epics unite verbally in the grand chorus of fatalism :

dāivam eva param manye pāuruṣaṁ tu nirarthakam,

"Fate alone I deem important ; useless is the toil of man."¹

Occasionally a slight change in the reading occurs without in any way affecting the real identity of the proverb as found in both epics. In R. B. ii. 122. 17 ff. (a passage entirely wanting in C.) there is a pretty plain equivalent of Manu ix. 303 ff., in which the king is identified with various gods. The language here used shows unmistakable identity, though the list of gods in Manu is increased by one. It is not, however, this passage itself that is of chief interest, but its prototype, which is connected with it by the

¹ This proverb is found in this form M. ii. 47. 36 (with *ca* for *tu*) and R. i. 58. 22-23 = B. 60. 25. An alternate formula, *dhik pāuruṣam anarthakam*, *Spr.* 2974, occurs M. vii. 135. 1 and viii. 9. 3. The revolt against the fatalism of these proverbs is found philosophically elaborated in the Mahābhārata, where Luck and Fate as well as Nature and one's own ability are all repudiated as factors in determining events, and "the fruit of former actions" explains everything, M. iii. 32. 20 and elsewhere. The Rāmāyaṇa does not seem to employ the term *haṭha* (which is rendered 'Nothwendigkeit' in PW. and 'Zufall' in *Spr.* 5323) in its philosophical sense, unless the late verse B. v. 85. 11 be an exception, where *haṭhena* may be rendered 'by happy accident.' But the Mahābhārata also employs *haṭha* only in late passages. I may add that the proverb attributed in *Spruch* 1979 to the Agni Purāṇa (with the second hemistich *dāivam puruṣakāreṇa ghnanti cārāḥ sadodyamāḥ*) is already found in R. B. ii. 20. 8-9: *klībā hi dāivam evāi 'kaṁ praśaṁsanti na pāuruṣam, pratipam api śaknōmi vyasanāyābhyupāgatam dāivam puruṣakāreṇa pratiroddhum, arindama.*

pāda phrase *Yamasya Varuṇasya ca*. This formula (compare also *Manu* vii. 4) takes us back of the seven and eight forms of the king here recognized to the earlier identification with five forms, such as is found in *R.* iii. 40. 12 :

pañca rūpāṇi rājāno dhārayanty amilāujasaḥ
Agner Indrasya Somasya Yamasya Varuṇasya ca,

“Kings whose power is unbounded are incorporations of five gods, Agni, Indra, Soma, Yama, and Varuṇa.” The corresponding passage in the *Gorresio* text, 44. 12, has *dhanadasya ca*, which apparently is an attempt to bring in a god belonging to another list, but the same text at iv. 17. 26 keeps the stereotyped *Varuṇasya ca*. Now, despite its different form this proverb must be the same with that implied in *M.* xii. 68. 41 :

kurute pañca rūpāṇi kālayuktāni yaḥ sadā
bhavaty Agnis tathā 'dityo Mr̥tyur Vāiṣṭavaṇo Yamaḥ,

“(The king), who assumes five incorporations of gods as given by Fate, becomes in turn Agni, Āditya, Mr̥tyu, Vāiṣṭavaṇa, and Yama.” This ending is also stereotyped, and the next advance is that of *M.* xii. 139. 103 :

mātā pitā gurur goptā vahnir Vāiṣṭavaṇo Yamaḥ
sapta rājño guṇān etān Manur āha Prajāpatiḥ,

“These seven qualities of a king have been declared by Father *Manu*, namely, his identity with one's father, mother, teacher, protector, and with the gods Agni, Vāiṣṭavaṇa, and Yama, respectively.” Various as are the elaborated forms, each epic apparently knows a proverb on the king's “five forms.”¹

Another group of five gives us a ritualistic proverb, which appears in the *Rāmāyaṇa* with the common device already spoken of, whereby a local vocative supplants part of the text. In *M.* xii. 141. 70 we read :

pañca pañcanakhā bhakṣyā brahmakṣatrasya vāi viṣaḥ,

“Five five-nailed animals are edible for a Brahman, Kṣatriya, and Vāiṣya.” But in the *Rāmāyaṇa* the Vāiṣya is omitted, in order to drag in the vocative *Rāghava*, thus :

pañca pañcanakhā bhakṣyā brahmakṣatreṇa (-kṣatreṣu),
Rāghava,

¹ In *Spruch* 3863 the form in the *Rāmāyaṇa* is given.

"Five five-nailed animals are edible for a Brahman, and Kṣatriya, O Rāghava," R. iv. 17. 39; B. 16. 32.¹

Proverbial phrases sometimes seem to be dramatically utilized. Thus in R. vi. 71. 63: *bālo 'yam iti vijñāya na cā 'vajñātum arhasi, bālān vā yadi vā vṛddhān mṛtyuṁ jānīhi mām raṇe* (so B., C. *saṁyuge*), we are irresistibly reminded of M. xii. 68. 40: *na hi jātva avamantavyo manuṣya iti bhūmipah*, and Manu vii. 8: *bālo 'pi nā 'vamantavyo manuṣya iti bhūmipah*; while *bālān vā yadi vā vṛddham* (like many *vā yadi vā* phrases) is proverbial (*Spr.* 4448), and here put into *ad hominem* form.

I will now give what further identical proverbs I have found in the two epics. The variants are generally too slight to affect the sense,² though important as regards the relation of the texts.

aṣṭamedhasahasraṁ ca satyaṁ ca tulayā dhṛtam,

M. i. 74. 103; xiii. 22. 14; R. B. ii. 61. 10. The next hemistich differs in all. R. is followed by general aphorisms on truth like M. xii. 199. 65. Compare also R. ii. 109. 10 ff.; *Spruch* 731.

indriyāṇāṁ prasṛṣṭānāṁ hayānāṁ iva vartmasu,

etc., *Spruch* 1118; M. iii. 211. 25; R. vii. 59 (2). 23; B. 63. 23.

*guror apy avaliptasya kāryākāryam ajānataḥ
utpathapratipannasya parityāgo vidhiyate,*

M. v. 178. 48; *nyāyyaṁ bhavati ṣāsanam*, i. 140. 54; *daṇḍo bhavati ṣaṣvataḥ*, xii. 57. 7; *utpatham . . daṇḍo bhavati ṣāsanam*, xii. 140. 48; *kāryaṁ bhavati ṣāsanam*, R. ii. 21. 13; *kāmakārapravṛttasya na kāryaṁ bruvato vacaḥ*, R. B. ii. 22. 11. Only the first hemistich is the same, and even in M. the last *pāda* of the second is without fixed form. In M. this stanza is ascribed to

¹ Compare Manu v. 17-18. Just where proverb-literature meets didactic wisdom is not easy to determine. Thus R. B. v. 81. 37 ff. works out a *ṣāstra-viniṣṭaya* on the "four means," *sāma*, *upadrudāna*, *bheda*, *daṇḍa*, which is later than the "three means" elsewhere recognized in the Rāmāyaṇa itself and in the Mahābhārata. See *Ruling Caste*, p. 182, note, and compare R. iv. 17. 29; B. 16. 22.

² Occasionally they change the sense considerably. Thus R. vi. 64. 7-8: *karma cāi 'va hi sarveṣāṁ kāraṇānāṁ prayojanam . . adharmānarthayoḥ prāp-taṁ phalaṁ ca prātyavāyikam*, becomes in B. 43. 7-8: *kāma eva hi . . (and) adharmānarthayoḥ prāptiḥ phalaṁ vāi pratyavāyikam* (sic; this word appears to have found no place in the Lexicon).

Marutta; in R. to Manu. In M. punishment is inflicted on the good-for-nothing teacher; in R. B. only his advice may be ignored. In R. B. the verse is followed by

*daṣa viprān upādhyāyo gāuraveṇā 'tiricyate
upādhyāyān daṣa pitā tathāi 'va vyatiricyate,*

etc., like M. xii. 108. 16; xiii. 105. 14-15; Manu ii. 145; *Sprüche* 2180 and 2726.

na sā sabhā yatra na santi vṛddhāḥ,

etc., *Spruch* 3483; M. v. 35. 58; R. vii. 59 (3). 33; B. 64. 33.

bhartā vāi dāivataṁ param,

M. xii. 145. 4; *bhartā hi dāivataṁ strīṇām*, R. B. ii. 23. 4. Other forms of the same thought in R. B. are *bhartā strīṇām hi dāivataṁ*, i. 17. 16; *dāivataṁ hi patīḥ strīṇām*, ii. 38. 20 (compare ii. 68. 15, 42); *paramaṁ dāivataṁ patīḥ*, iii. 2. 23; 3. 2; v. 25. 11. For M. see *Ruling Caste*, p. 364, note. See also *Spruch* 4540 ff.

yo hi dharmāṁ samācṛitya,

etc., *Spruch* 5663; M. v. 37. 16; R. B. v. 88. 17, with v. 1.

mitaṁ dadāti hi pitā,

etc., *Spruch* 4848; M. xii. 148. 6-7; R. ii. 39. 30; B. 38. 25; iv. 20. 4.

yathā kāṣṭhaṁ ca kāṣṭhaṁ ca . . . evaṁ putrāḥ ca pautrāḥ ca,

etc., *Spruch* 5093; M. xii. 174. 15-16; R. ii. 105. 26-27, with v. 1.; B. 114. 12. Part of the proverb (in shorter form) in M. xii. 28. 36.

*yasya ṣūrasya vikrāntāir edhante bāndhavāḥ sukham
tridaṣā iva Ṣakrasya sādhu tasye 'ha jīvitam,*

M. v. 133. 44, compared with

*yasya pāuruṣam aṇanti mitrasvajanabāndhavāḥ
amarā iva Ṣakrasya saphalaṁ tasya jīvitam,*

R. B. v. 2. 36; *Sprüche* 5398 and 5383. This is perhaps the best example of proverbs couched in words so different as scarcely to unite verbally at all, and yet identical in sense and arrangement. "Noble on earth is the life of that hero whose relatives enjoy prosperity through his prowess, even as the thrice-eleven gods (do

through) Çakra's (prowess)"; and again, in the second version, "fruitful is the life of that man whose friends, family and relatives live on his valor, even as the immortals (do on) Çakra's (valor)."

saṁpannaṁ goṣu saṁbhāvyam,

etc., *Spruch* 6880; M. v. 36. 58; B. v. 88. 9; R. vi. 16. 9, v. 1.

sarve kṣayāntā nicayāḥ,

etc., M. xi. 2. 3, etc.; R. ii. 105. 16; B. 114. 3, etc., with v. 1. Repeated several times. See *Spruch* 6948.

sulabhā puruṣā rājan satataṁ priyavādinaḥ,

etc., *Spruch* 7131; M. v. 37. 15; B. iii. 41. 1; R. 37. 2, etc.

hanti jātān ajātān ca hiranyā 'rthe 'nṛtaṁ vadan,

M. v. 35. 34; *bhūmy arthe tv anṛtam vadan*, R. B. iv. 34. 15. Manu viii. 99 coincides with M. R. C. has only the *çatam aṣvānṛte* part, 34. 9; *Spruch* 7366.

haraṇaṁ ca parāsvānām,

etc., *Spruch* 7367; M. v. 33. 65; R. vi. 87. 23; B. 66. 26, v. 1.

Here are altogether twenty-odd separate proverbs which are nearly identical in the two epics.¹ I may add, moreover, that just as the Mahābhārata has a number of legal aphorisms which are found in Manu, so the Rāmāyaṇa has, in accordance with its smaller size, a less number of Manavic verses not found in the Mahābhārata; for example:

*rājabhir dhṛtadaṇḍāḥ ca kṛtvā pāpāni mānavāḥ
nirmalāḥ svargam āyānti santaḥ sukr̥tino yathā,*

R. iv. 18. 31; B. 17. 24, *dhṛtadaṇḍā ye; rājanirdhṛtadaṇḍās tu*, Manu viii. 318, where the oldest commentator has *rājabhir dhṛta*^o (v. 1. *rājabhiḥ kṛta*^o), as in the Rāmāyaṇa and Vas. xix. 45.

But apart from these isolated proverbs, there still remain certain groups or collections of proverbs, which form in both epics larger areas of contact. Thus a collection of proverbs on the virtue of wealth in M. xii. 8. 16 ff. is found again in R. vi. 83. 32 ff., with sundry additions, in the Rāmāyaṇa especially to the proverb *yasyā 'rthās tasya mītrāṇi*, which is here developed into three

¹In most of them R. B. agrees better with M. than does R. C., either by absence of the proverb in C. or by readings in B. more closely parallel to M.

stanzas. The other proverbs in this collection are *arthebhyo hi*, Spr. 618; *arthena hi*, Spr. 617; *yasyā 'rthās*, Spr. 5409; *adha-nenā°*, Spr. 212 and 619; *dharmah kāmaḥ ca*, Spr. 3091; and *viṣeṣaṁ nā 'dhigacchāmi patilasyā 'dhanasya ca*, which last is found at the beginning of the group in M. xii. 8. 15, while in R. it stands with v. l. at the end, B. 62. 39, though the other proverbs follow the same order in both poems, with slight variations and additions in each version. In *dharmah kāmaḥ ca*, for example, every text differs from every other :

*dharmah kāmaḥ ca svargaḥ ca harṣaḥ krodhaḥ ṣrutaṁ damaḥ
arthād etāni sarvāṇi pravartante narādhipa*

is M. in text B. 8. 21, and

dharmah kāmaḥ ca harṣaḥ ca dhṛtiḥ krodhaḥ ṣrutaṁ madaḥ

is the version in M. text C. 225; while R. C. 83. 39,

harṣaḥ kāmaḥ ca darpaḥ ca dharmah krodhaḥ ṣamo damaḥ,

gives quite a different list; and R. B. 62. 37,

*dharmah kāmaḥ ca darpaḥ ca harṣaḥ krodhaḥ sukhaṁ vayaḥ
arthād etāni sarvāṇi pravartante na saṁśayaḥ*,

adds new elements and extends the variants into the second hemistich (where the other versions are identical). Such a group as this incorporated as a whole into both epics argues a proverbial philosophy that had already attained to some literary elaboration; while the striking difference in text in the individual verses seems to show that neither epic copies directly from the other. But a mere concatenation of dissyllabic virtues and vices, such as we have here, is most easily subject to modification at the tongue and hand of every transmitter, so that no positive conclusions may safely be drawn from such an example, which is chiefly instructive in emphasizing the rather rare fact of both epics containing the same proverbial material co-ordinated in the same way.

In Manu vii. 3 it is said that the Deity created a king to protect the world, since men were scattered in fear in all directions when destitute of a king, *arājake loke*. This phrase has become a peg to hang proverbs on and both epics give us chapters on 'kingless' peoples. That in the Rāmāyaṇa, ii. 67, B. 69, is a combination of Mahābhārata xii. 67 and 68, where the catch-words, instead of *nā 'rājake janapade*, as in R., are respectively *arājakeṣu rāṣṭreṣu*,

rājā cen na bhavet, and *yadi rājā na pālayet* (in xii. 49. 70, *arājake jivaloke*), though they are not constant.¹ The order is about the same in R. C. and B. Keeping this as a norm :

R. B. 10, *nā 'rājake guroḥ ciṣyaḥ ṣṛṇoti niyatam hitam* ; M. 15. 42, *na preṣyā vacanam kuryur na bālāḥ* ; M. 68. 18, *guruḥ kliṣṇiyur apī*

R. 11, *arājake dhanam nā 'sti nā 'sti bhāryā 'py arājake*

B. 11, *svam nā 'sty arājake rāṣṭre puṁsām na ca parigrahaḥ*

M. xii. 68. 15 (compare 67. 12), *na dārā na ca putraḥ syān na dhanam na parigrahaḥ*

B. 12, *yajñāṣṭilā dvijātayaḥ . . dasyusaṅghāḥ prapīḍitāḥ* ; C. 13-14, *na satrāṇy anvāsate dāntāḥ . . na yajvanāḥ . . visṛjanty āptadakṣiṇāḥ*

M. 67. 2, *dasyavo 'bhībhavanty uta* ; 68. 20, *loko 'yam dasyusād bhavet* ; 68. 22, *na yajñāḥ saṁpravarteyur vidhivat svāptadak-ṣiṇāḥ* ; 68. 25 and 15. 39, *na saṁvatsarasatrāṇi tiṣṭheyuḥ*

R. C. 12, *nā 'rājake janapade kārayanti sabhām narāḥ* (B. *janāḥ sabhām*)

udyānāni ca ramyāṇi hr̥ṣṭāḥ puṇyāgrhāṇi ca (B. *prapāḥ*)

15, *na . . prahr̥ṣṭanaṭanartakāḥ utsavāḥ ca samājāḥ ca* ; B.

17, *na vivāhāḥ ca vartante*

M. 68. 22-23, *na vivāhāḥ samājo vā . . na mathyeraṇḥ ca gargarāḥ ; ghoṣāḥ prañāṣaṁ gaccheyur yadi rājā na pālayet*²

R. B. 15, *vyavahārā na vartante dharmāḥ sajjanasevitāḥ*

M. 67. 3, *dharmo na vyavatiṣṭhate* ; 68. 17, *adharmāḥ pragṛhitāḥ syāt*

R. B. 16, *vedān nā 'dhīyate viprāḥ*

M. 68. 26, *brāhmaṇāḥ caturo vedān nā 'dhīyirāṇs tapasvinaḥ*

R. B. 17 ; M. 67. 12 ; 68. 22 (above) ; M. 15. 37, *na brahmacāry adhiyita . . na kanyo 'dvahanaṁ gacchet*

R. B. 18, *nā 'rājake janapade viṣvastāḥ kulakanyakāḥ alaṁkṛtā rājamārgaḥ krīḍanti viharanti ca*

M. 68. 32, *striyaḥ cā 'puruṣā mārgaṁ sarvālaṁkārabhūṣitāḥ nirbhayāḥ pratipadyante yadi rakṣati bhūmipāḥ*

R. B. 19, *vicaranty akutobhayāḥ*

R. C. 18, *na . . dhanavantaḥ surakṣitāḥ ṣerate vivṛtadvārāḥ*

¹ M. xii. 15 and 67-68 are variations on the same theme. See below.

² Add R. C. 20-21, where the bells on the elephants and the *ghoṣa* of arms are mentioned in an elaboration of joys of peace without parallel in M.

- M. 68. 30, *vivṛtya hi yathākāmaṁ gṛhadvārāṇi cerate*
manuṣyā rakṣitā rājñā samantād akutobhayāḥ
 (akutobhayāḥ as ending in M. 68. 25 and 30; and R. B.
 19 and 20).
- R. C. 22, *na . . vaṇijo dūragāmināḥ gacchanti kṣemam adhvā-*
nam bahupaṇyasamācitāḥ (B. 21, v. 1.). Compare
 M. ii. 5. 114.
- M. 68. 21, *na kṛṣir na vaṇikpathaḥ*
- R. C. 29, *yathā hy anudakā nadyaḥ . . agopālā yathā gāvaḥ* (B.
agopāḥ ca)
- M. 68. 11-13, *yathā hy anudake matsyāḥ . . agopāḥ paçavo yathā*
 R. B. 26, *vināçam āpnoti tathā rāṣṭram arājakam*
- M. 68. 13, *evam eva vinā rājñā vinaçyeyur imāḥ prajāḥ* (so 15. 30).
- R. B. 27, *haranti durbalānām hi svam ākramya balānvitāḥ*
 M. 68. 14, *hareyur balavanto 'pi durbalānām parigrahān*
 M. 49. 70, *arājake jīvaloke durbalā balavattarāḥ pīḍyante*
 R. B. 28, *arājake janapade durbalān balavattarāḥ*
bhakṣayanti nirudvegā matsyān matsyā ivā 'lpakān
 R. C. 31, *matsyā ivā janā nityaṁ bhakṣayanti parasparam*
 M. 15. 30 and 67. 16, *jale matsyā ivā 'bhakṣyan durbalān bala-*
*vattarāḥ*¹
- Manu vii. 20, *çūle (jale) . . 'pakṣyan durbalān balavattarāḥ*
 M. 67. 17, *parasparaṁ bhakṣayanto matsyā ivā jale kṛṣān*
 M. 68. 8, *prajā rājabhayād eva na khādanti parasparam* (so 15. 7).
- R. C. 32, *ye hi saṁbhinnamāryādā nāstikāç chinnasaṁçayāḥ*
te 'pi bhāvāya kalpante rājadaṇḍanipīḍitāḥ
 M. 15. 33, *ye 'pi saṁbhinnamāryādā nāstikā vedanindakāḥ*
*te 'pi bhogāya kalpante daṇḍenā 'çu nipīḍitāḥ*²
 M. 15. 34, *daṇḍasya hi bhayād bhīto bhogāyāi 'va pravartate*
- R. B. 30, *andhaṁ tama ive 'dam syān na prājñāyata kiṁcana*
rājā cen na bhavel loke vibhajan sādhuśādhunī
 M. 15. 32, *andhaṁ tama ive 'dam syān na prājñāyata kiṁcana*
daṇḍaç cen na bhavel loke vibhajan sādhuśādhunī

¹ Compare M. 15. 20, *sattvāḥ sattvā hi jīvanti durbalāir balavattarāḥ*.

² Manu vii. 23, *te 'pi bhogāya kalpante daṇḍenāi 'va nipīḍitāḥ*. Manu vii. 22, *daṇḍasya hi bhayāt sarvaṁ jagat bhogāya kalpate*.

M. 15. 7; 68. 10, *andhe tamasi majjeyur* (*yadi daṇḍo na pālayet*, 15. 7), (*apaṇṇantaḥ parasparam*, 68. 10)

R. B. 31, *dasyavo 'pi na ca kṣemaṁ rāṣṭre vindanty arājake dvāv ādadāte hy ekasya dvayoḥ ca bahavo dhanam*

M. 67. 14, *pāpā hy api tadā kṣemaṁ na labhante kadācana ekasya hi dvāu harato dvayoḥ ca bahavo 'pare.*

These groups have apparently a common source, rather than a similitude based on copying.

Of some of the legends a few characteristic hall-marks will show the underlying unity. Thus in the account of the churning of the ocean, M. i. 18. 13:

manthānaṁ Mandaraṁ kṛtvā tathā netraṁ ca Vāsukim

of which the first three words are repeated in Hariv. 4603; while R. B. i. 46. 21,

manthānaṁ Mandaraṁ kṛtvā netraṁ kṛtvā tu Vāsukim

is identical (C. 45. 18 varies: *tato niṣcitya mathanaṁ yoktraṁ kṛtvā ca Vāsukim manthānaṁ Mandaraṁ kṛtvā mamanthur amitāujasaḥ*). B. here stands nearer to M.

The tale of Surabhi is inserted in R. ii. 74, B. 76, or rather this episode is inserted in R. for the sake of the tale, as the rest of the chapter is a mere repetition of what precedes. In M. iii. 9. 4 the story begins with

paraṁ putrān na vidyate;

in R. B. 76. 25,

nā 'sti putrāt paraṁ priyam (*putrasamo priyaḥ*, C. 74. 24).

In M. it is an *ākhyāna*, dramatic, '*Indra uvāca*,' etc. Surabhi exclaims (9-10) *ahaṁ tu putraṁ ṣocāmi . . paṇḍyāi 'naṁ karṣakaṁ kṣudraṁ durbalaṁ mama putraṁ pratodenā 'bhinighnantaṁ lāṅgalena ca pīḍitam*. In R. B. 76. 23-24: *ahaṁ putrāu ṣocāmi . . . pratodaprabhiraṅgāu . . pīḍyamānau lāṅgalena karṣa-keṇa durātmanā*. Here too B. agrees better with M.

In the story of Nandinī we read,

R. i. 54. 10; B. 55. 10, *na tvāṁ tyajāmi śabale*

M. i. 175. 31, *na tvāṁ tyajāmi kalyāṇi.*

Just before this M. 23:

*hambhāyamānā kalyāṇī Vasiṣṭhasyā 'tha Nandini
āgamyā 'bhimukhī Pārtha tasthāu,*

like R. B. 55. 7 :

Vasiṣṭhasyā 'grataḥ sthitvā hambhāravavirāviṇī

(in C. 54. 7, *rudantī meghaniḥsvanā*). The phrase *Viṣvāmitrasya paṣyataḥ*, R. 19, B. 18, is found (twice) in M. 40 and 41. Also M. 36, *yonideṣāc ca yavanān* = R. 55. 3; B. 56. 3; and ib. *ṣakṛd deṣāc chakās tathā* in B. (*ṣakṛd deṣāc chakāḥ smṛtāḥ* in C.), like *ṣakṛtaḥ ṣabarān bahūn* in M. Then M. 45, *dhig balaṁ kṣatriya-balaṁ brahmatejo balaṁ balaṁ*, and R. 56. 23, *dhig balaṁ kṣatriya-balaṁ brahmatejo balaṁ balaṁ* (also B.; compare R. 54. 14, *na balaṁ kṣatriyasyā 'hur brāhmaṇā balavattarāḥ*), establish the identity of the two versions; B. being a bit closer to M.

The identity of Hariv. 13809 ff. with R. vi. 58. 24 (B. 32. 20) ff. needs only a glance to establish, but as the specimen is very instructive of the method in which scenes were handed down it may be interesting to examine it somewhat in detail. The first *śloka* in H. is the third in R., but I shall transpose it to the third place for greater clearness of view¹:

Rāmāyaṇa.

*amṛṣyamāṇas (tat karma
Prahasto ratham āṣṛitaḥ)
cakāra kadanāṁ ghorāṁ
dhanuṣpāṇir (vanāukasām)
āvarta iva saṁjajñe
balasya mahato mahān (B)²
kṣubitasyā 'prameyasya
sāgarasye 'va saṁplave (B)³
mahatā hi ṣarāugheṇa
(rākṣaso raṇadurmadaḥ)⁴
ardayāmāsa saṁkruddho
(vānarāṇām) ṣarirāis tu
(rākṣasānām) ca medinī
babhūva nicitā⁵ (ghorāiḥ)*

Harivaṅṣa.

*amṛṣyamāṇas (tridaṣān
āhavasthān udāyudhān)
cakāra kadanāṁ ghorāṁ
dhanuṣpāṇir (mahāsuraḥ)
āvarta iva saṁjajñe
balasya mahato mahān
kṣubitasyā 'prameyasya
sāgarasye 'va saṁplavaḥ
mahatā ca balāugheṇa
(Anuhrādāḥ surottamam)
ardayāmāsa saṁkruddho
(Dhanādhyakṣaṁ pratāpavān)
(tridaṣānām) ṣarirāiḥ ca
(dānavānām) ca medinī
babhūva nicitā (sarvā)*

¹ The opening phrase of R., *amṛṣyamāṇas*, is a stock expression, e. g. R. vi. 67. 142; 69. 141, *amṛṣyamāṇas taṁ ghoṣam*, etc.

² C. here has *senayor ubhayos tadā*.

³ C. *niḥsvanāḥ*.

⁴ B. *Prahasto yudhi durmadaḥ*.

⁵ So B.; C. has *babhūvā 'ticitā ghorāiḥ*.

<i>parvatāir iva saṁvṛtā</i> (C.) ¹	<i>parvatāir iva saṁvṛtā</i>
(<i>sā mahi rudhirāugheṇa</i>	(<i>Meruprṣṭhaṁ tu raktena</i>
<i>prachannā</i>) ² <i>saṁprakāṣate</i>	<i>rañjitaṁ</i>) <i>saṁprakāṣate</i>
(<i>saṁchannā</i>) <i>mādhave māsi</i>	(<i>sarvato</i>) <i>mādhave māsi</i>
<i>puṣpīlāir iva kiṁṣukāiḥ</i> (B. 25a) ³	<i>puṣpīlāir iva kiṁṣukāiḥ</i>

The next five ślokas are omitted in B. altogether. I give first the version of R. C. and then of M. in alternate hemistichs :

R.	<i>hatavirāughavaprāṇ tu bhagnāyudhamahādramām</i>
H.	<i>hatāir virāir gajāir aṣvāiḥ prāvartata mahānadi</i>
R.	<i>ṣoṇitāughamahātoyāṁ yamasāgaragāminīm</i>
H.	<i>ṣoṇitodā mahāghorā yamarāṣṭravivardhini</i>
R.	<i>yakṛtphlihamahāpaṅkāṁ vinikīrṇāntraṣāivalām</i>
H.	<i>ṣakṛnmedomahāpaṅkā viprakīrṇāntraṣāivalā</i>
R.	<i>bhinnakāyaṣirominām aṅgāvayavaṣādvalām</i>
H.	<i>chinnakāyaṣirominā hy aṅgāvayavaṣarkarā</i>
R.	<i>gṛdhrahaṇsavarakīrṇāṁ kaṅkasārasasevitām</i>
H.	<i>gṛdhrahaṇsagaṇākīrṇā kaṅkasārasanādinī</i>
R.	<i>medaḥphenasamākīrṇāṁ āvartasvananīḥsvanām</i>
H.	<i>vaṣāphenasamākīrṇā protkrusṭastanīlasvanā</i>
R.	<i>tām kāpuruṣadustārāṁ yuddhabhūmimayīm nadīm</i>
H.	<i>tām kāpuruṣadurdharṣāṁ yudhabhūmimahānadīm</i>
R.	<i>nadīm iva ghanāpāye haṇsasārasasevitām</i>
H.	<i>nadīm ivā 'tapāpāye haṇsasārasaṣobhitām</i>
R.	<i>rākṣasāḥ kapimukhyās te terus tām dustarāṁ nadīm</i>
H.	<i>tridaṣā dānavāḥ cāi 'va terus tām dustarāṁ tadā</i>
R. 33. b.	<i>yathā padmarajodhvastām nalinīm gajayūthapāḥ</i>
H. 13818.	<i>yathā padmarajodhvastām nalinīm gajayūthapāḥ</i>

Rāmāyaṇa C. 34 and B. 25b.

Harivaṇṣa 13819.

<i>tataḥ sṛjantaṁ bāṇāughān</i>	<i>tataḥ sṛjantaṁ bāṇāughān</i>
(<i>Prahastaṁ</i>) <i>syandane sthitam</i>	(<i>Anuhrādaṁ</i>) <i>rathe sthitam</i>
<i>dadarṣa tarasā</i> (<i>Nilo</i>	<i>dadarṣa tarasā</i> (<i>devo</i>
<i>vinighnantam</i> ⁴ <i>plavaṅgamān</i>)	<i>nighnantaṁ yakṣavāhinīm</i>)

After this the resemblance is again with C. alone, though not very exact, for a few verses further. A phrase of H. 13825 in

¹ B. *patitāir iva parvatāiḥ*.

² B. *saṁchannā sma prakāṣate*.

³ C. 28, *palāṣāir iva puṣpīlāiḥ*.

⁴ So B.; C. *vidhamantam*.

R. C. 40 and B. 28, *vavarṣa ṣaravarṣāṇi*, introduces a striking simile:

C. 41: *tasya bāṇagaṇān eva rākṣasasya durātmanah
apārayan vārayitum pratyagrhnān nimilitah
yathāi 'va govṛṣo varṣam ṣāradam ṣighram āgatam
evam eva . . . ṣaravarṣān . . . nimilitākṣah sahasā . . . sehe.*

(B. 28: *tadyathā govṛṣo* etc. . . *asahata*; so H. 13826, *tadyathā
ṣāradam varṣam govṛṣah . . . pratigrhnāti . . . evam eva
. . . asahata*).

This simile belongs to R. It is found in B. iii. 32. 4 in a slightly different form and application. In C. ib. 26. 4, *pratigrhya ca tad varṣam nimilita iva 'rṣabhah*, the simile is united by *nimilita* with the present passage, which is not the case with B., though the latter has *ṣāradam* as here: *pratigrhya tu tad varṣam ghoram ṣatrunisūdanah ṣāradam sthūlapṛṣatam ṣṛṅgābhyām govṛṣo yathā*.

With C. 43, B. 30, all resemblance with the Harivaṅga ceases till in C. 54, B. 41-42, the verse

*sa gatāsur gataṣṛiko gatasatvo gatendriyah
(pāpāta sahasā bhūmāu chinnamūla iva drumah)¹*

recalls an entirely different passage of the Harivaṅga, viz. 3721 ff., where is found in the same connection the same unusual phrase:

*(kharah . . . pāpāta dharaṇītale)
tam gatāsum gataṣṛikam vikṣya, etc.*

The epic scholar will recognize many regular phrases in the passage given above. Such iterata are, for example, *cakāra kadanam ghoram*, *āvarta iva*, *mahatā hi ṣarāugheṇa*, *parvatāir iva saṁvṛtā*, *puṣpitāir iva kiṁṣukaiḥ*, and in the *balasāgara* (which is a commonplace of the epic), *yamarāṣṭravivardhinī*, *vinikirṇān-traṣāivalā* (R. vi. 7. 20), etc.

¹ The words *pāpāta*, etc. are fixed phrases; e. g. R. B. ii. 95. 2:

pāpāta sahasā bhūmāu mūlabhraṣṭa iva drumah

B. iii. 26. 24 (compare M. viii. 96. 54):

chinnamūlā iva drumāḥ (C. *bhinna*^o)

And the whole hemistich, B. ii. 74. 19 (v. l. in C.):

pāpāta sahasā bhūmāu chinnamūla iva drumah.

In the story of Ahalyā¹ are related in R. i. 48 Ahalyā's temporary extinction and Indra's fate from the curse of Gāutama, *tvam viphalo bhava*, and the denouement (49. 8): *utpātya meṣavṛṣaṇāu sahasrākṣe nyaveṣayan* (or B., *utkṛtya . . . Indrāyo 'padaduḥ*). According to one account in the Mahābhārata, Indra was not destroyed, although cursed by Gāutama for making love to Ahalyā.² In the bare allusion to his adultery elsewhere³ no result of Indra's sins seems to be known, as it is simply said *Ahalyā dharṣitā pūrvam . . . jīvato bhartur Indreṇa*, with the reproachful addition *sa vaḥ kiṁ na nivāritāḥ* (addressed to the gods), and the statement that he had committed divers other wrongs and deceits. But in another passage the particular curse ascribed in the Rāmāyaṇa to Gāutama is attributed to Kauçika, Ahalyā's husband according to the Śadvinça Br., while Gāutama is credited only with making the god's hair turn yellow: *'Ahalyā-dharṣaṇanimittaṁ hi Gāutamād dhariṣmaḥrutām Indrah prāp-taḥ; Kāuçikanimittaṁ ce 'ndro muṣkaviyogaṁ meṣavṛṣaṇatvaṁ cā 'vāpa*.⁴ The former legend does not appear in the Rāmāyaṇa. In the epithet *sahasranayana*, common to the two epics, may possibly lie in the Rāmāyaṇa the implication of the explanation (= *sahasramuṣka*) given in the Mahābhārata xiii. 34. 26 ff.:

*yathā mahārṇave kṣiptā sitāneṣṭur⁵ vinaṣyati
tathā duṣcaritaṁ sarvaṁ parābhāvāya kalpate
paçya candre kṛtaṁ lakṣma samudro lavaṇodakaḥ
tathā bhagasahasreṇa mahendraḥ paricihnitaḥ⁶
teṣāṁ eva prabhāvena sahasranayano⁷ hy asāu
çatakratuḥ samabhavat,*

that is: Every wrong committed against the priestly caste makes for destruction, even as a clod of earth is destroyed when thrown into a flood. For example, the spots on the moon and the salt of

¹ Compare Oertel on *Indrasya kilbiṣāṇi* in JAOS. XIX, pp. 118 ff.

² xiii. 154. 6: *atha çaptaç ca bhagavān Gāutamena Purandaraḥ Ahalyām kāmāyāno vāi dharmārthaṁ ca na hīṁsitaḥ*.

³ M. v. 12. 6. Holtzmann in ZDMG. XXXII; Oertel, loc. cit.

⁴ M. xii. 343. 23. Compare the rare epithet *meṣāṇḍa*, R. B. vii. 38. 29.

⁵ C. *leṣṭuḥ* (*pāṇsupiṇḍaḥ*).

⁶ xiii. 41. 21: *na tan manasi sthitam Gāutamenā 'si yan mukto bhagāṅka-paricihnitaḥ*. Ahalyā is mentioned once more, xiv. 56. 28.

⁷ R. C. vii. 72. 8: *sa Rāmaṁ mantrimadhyasthaṁ paçyann amaramadhyasthaṁ sahasranayanaṁ yathā*.

the sea (were caused by the righteous anger of priests). On the other hand, their power is so great that when Indra was marked with a thousand *bhaga* marks (through a priest's wrath) they alone turned these marks into eyes, so that Indra became "Thousand-eyed." But as an entirely different explanation given elsewhere in the *Mahābhārata*, i. 211. 27-28, refers the thousand orbs to admiration of *Tilottamā*, which forced out eyes on the god's body :

mahendrasyā 'pi (draṣṭukāmasya) netrāṇāṃ prsthataḥ pārṣvato
'grataḥ
raktāntānāṃ viçālānāṃ sahasraṃ sarvato 'bhavat
(tathā sahasranetraḥ ca babhūva balasūdanaḥ),

it is doubtful of which legend the *Rāmāyaṇa* has cognizance. The epithet may of course be without implication of either legend, like its equivalent *sahasrākṣa*. All that appears certain is that both epics preserve the older feature of the ram-story, while in the account of *Ahalyā*'s discomfiture and long suppression there is a later phase of the tale, recounted in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Kathāsaritsāgara*, but not alluded to in the *Mahābhārata*.

I must leave for another time the discussion of the identical passages in *Harivaṃṣa* 13666 ff., R. vi. 44; *Hariv.* 12825 ff., R. iv. 40; M. i. 66, R. iii. 14.

WASHBURN HOPKINS.

III.—STUDIES IN THE SCRIPTORES HISTORIAE AUGUSTAE.

The Sources.

The object of this paper is to establish certain portions of the text of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, as an aid to the solution of the larger problem of the authorship of the collection. The particular investigation is in *Vita Caracallae*, V, *Aelii Spartiani*.

The work of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, an excerpt collection about a century¹ removed from the source, is characterized by Mommsen² as the most pitiful scribbling. Peter, in the last edition of the standard text, uses various forms of parenthesis, to indicate that the parts inclosed are of different degrees of historical uncertainty, caused usually by transposition of excerpts from the sources or insertion of platitudes.³ The relation of the S. H. A. to their sources is, therefore, the first question to be considered. I shall take note only of those sources that are of use in the solution of particular problems in the life of Caracalla.

The critics are agreed that the main source of Aelius Spartianus is Marius Maximus, identified by Teuffel⁴ with the praefectus urbi of this name under Macrinus, 217/18, who was consul for the second time in 223. As an officer of high rank he had the fullest opportunity for getting information at first hand. He wrote lives of the emperors from Nerva to Elagabalus, continuing and imitating Suetonius, but differing from his model, says Peter,⁵ in his more elaborate reproduction of the gossip of the time drawn from

¹ I do not attempt to discuss the exact time of the publication of this collection. See Dessau, *Hermes*, XXIV, pp. 337-92; Mommsen, *Hermes*, XXV, pp. 228-92.

² *Hermes*, XXV, p. 229.

³ '*Scriptores Historiae Augustae*' iterum recensuit. H. Peter, Praefatio, p. xxxiii.

⁴ Teuffel-Schwabe: '*Hist. of Roman Literature*.' Translated by Warr, 381, 2.

⁵ '*Die S. H. A. Sechs litterar-geschichtliche Untersuchungen*.' H. Peter, Leipzig, 1892, p. 105.

the 'acta urbis.' As an authority for this period he ranks second only to Dion Cassius.

The extent of the dependence of Spartianus upon Marius Maximus is variously estimated.

Rübel¹ in his discussion of the sources of the lives from Hadrian to Heliogabalus, after merely mentioning the contributions of Dirksen and of Krause to the subject, says: "Müller,² qui nuper de hac re disseruit, scriptores in vitis priorum imperatorum describendis solum fere Marium Maximum secutos esse, demonstrasse sibi visus est. Cuius sententiam cum probare non possim, demonstrare conabor, scriptores maximam quidem partem Marium Maximum excerptisse, sed in vitis quas scripserunt aliis quoque ex auctoribus quaedam inseruisse." Dreinhöfer³ says in regard to the Life of Caracalla: "Nihil igitur iam dubium potest esse, quin tota fere haec vita de Mario Maximo descripta sit." The qualifying 'fere' he makes applicable to the statements in the latter part of the Life of Caracalla and says he is unable to decide whether they come from Marius or not.

Plew⁴ says: "Sie [S. H. A.] schreiben, die dem Marius Maximus gehörigen Stücke aus den sekundären Quellen *in der Form, wie diese sie boten, zugleich* mit den übrigen Wust ab, d. h. sie benutzten M. Maximus nur indirect."

Hermann Peter⁵ says: "Es bildete also für die Kaiserbiographien zwar der breite Marius Maximus die Grundlage; wir haben ausserdem noch die Benutzung jeder Kaiserchronik festgestellt und werden uns vielleicht nicht einmal damit begnügen können." The 'Kaiserchronik' here referred to is the unknown source of Spartianus which Enmann⁶ identifies with the source of Aurelius Victor (in the 'De Caesaribus') and of Eutropius. In Enmann's article we have a number of parallelisms⁷ between Spartianus, Victor and Eutropius. The significant fact to be noted in them is that

¹ 'De Fontibus Quattuor Priorum H. A. S.' Bonnae, 1872, p. 1.

² Büdinger: 'Untersuchungen zur Kaisergeschichte, III, pp. 17-202. Joh. Jac. Müller: 'Der Geschichtschreiber L. Marius Maximus.'

³ 'De Font. et Auctoribus Vitarum Quae Feruntur Spartiani, Capitolini, Gallicani, Lampridii.' Adolphus Dreinhöfer, Halis Saxonum, 1875, p. 30.

⁴ 'Marius Maximus als directe und indirecte Quelle der S. H. A.' von J. Plew, 1878, p. 12.

⁵ 'Die S. H. A.,' p. 98.

⁶ 'Eine verlorene Geschichte der römischen Kaiser,' von A. Enmann, Phil. Sup. B. IV, pp. 335-501.

⁷ Pp. 371, 2.

Victor and Eutropius show similarities only to the latter part of the Life of Caracalla as given by Spartianus. This makes it evident that Victor and Eutropius did not copy from the completed life by Spartianus, but from some other source which Spartianus had used in making up the second part of his biography. We may, therefore, assume that Spartianus in writing his biographies pursued the following method: for the first part of a life he used Marius Maximus; for the latter part, the 'Verlorene Geschichte' of Enmann. There seems to be an actual difference in nature between Marius Maximus and this lost source, shown in the preponderance, in the latter part of the lives, of references to things apparently taken from the 'acta urbis' or some such record; e. g. 'opera publica,' 'signa mortis,' 'honores post mortem.' (See Dreinhöfer, p. 9.) Dreinhöfer attributes all of the skeleton of the biographies to Marius Maximus. The incorrectness of this hypothesis is shown by the fact already noted that only the last part of this outline appears in Victor and Eutropius. In this connection it is significant that in the parts that can be specifically referred to Marius Maximus¹ we have only one quotation from the 'acta senatus' and no reference to the 'acta urbis.' In the 'descriptio personae' coming in the middle of Dreinhöfer's outline and the 'descriptio temporum' at the end, there seem to be indications of the editorial work of Spartianus in patching together his two sources. This needs further study.

Dion Cassius is, by general agreement, considered the most trustworthy literary source for this period. As praetor under Pertinax, one high in the favor of Septimius Severus, an attendant of Caracalla on his journey to the Orient, praefect of Smyrna and Pergamos, proconsul in Africa, consul for the second time in 229,² he possessed during his entire life access to the most valuable sources of information concerning the government. In spite of his strong personal bias against the absolute monarchy established by Severus, his statements of fact may be accepted as reliable. Did the S. H. A. use Dion as a source? Dreinhöfer³ says: "Dione Cassio scriptores historiae Augustae in vitis describendis nihil usi sunt." Haupt⁴ says: "Die anklänge Dio's an

¹ 'Historicorum Romanorum Fragmenta.' Peter. Marius Maximus, Frag. Vit. 16.

² Dion 73, 12; 79, 7; 80, 1 and 4; CIL. III 5587. Cf. 'Gesch. der griech. Lit.,' von Christ, 561.

³ L. I. Thesis, II, p. 49.

⁴ Philologus 44, p. 575.

Spartian's Caracallus und Lampridius' Heliogabalus bespricht J. J. Müller (nr. 4, p. 96, 113), der auch in diesen abschnitten die Historia Augusta als unabhängig von dem namentlich über die orientalischen verhältnisse vorzüglich informirten Dio erklärt." The possibility that Marius Maximus used Dion or vice versa need not be considered because, if such had been the case, the results would have been manifest in the investigation of the relation of Spartianus to Dion. Then, too, we may assume the very great unlikelihood of two contemporaneous writers of this time using each other's accounts of events of which each had been eye-witnesses.

Of other literary sources for this period we should consider Aurelius Victor.

Enmann¹ says, with reference to the sources of the 'De Caesaribus': "Mit ausnahme des Alamannenkrieges, der übrigens unter allen historikern nur hier von Victor erzählt wird, und des todes stammen somit alle nachrichten Victors über Caracalla ganz sicher aus der gemeinsamen Kaiserquelle." This 'Kaiserquelle' is the source used also by Spartianus and Eutropius. This lost source Enmann² believes belongs between the years 292 and 305. 'The Epitome' of Aurelius Victor, Teuffel seems to think,³ is dependent upon Marius Maximus as an (indirect) authority for Chaps. 12-23.

Herodian does not need to be considered as a source for events early in 213, with which this paper deals, as he passes them without mention.⁴ The same may be said of Orosius and Eutropius, and of the Byzantine writers, Zosimus and Zonaras.

The conclusions as to literary sources may be stated as follows:

First. Aelius Spartianus has used Marius Maximus for the first part of the Life of Caracalla. For the second part he has followed in the main a source, now lost, used by Victor in 'De Caesaribus,' and by Eutropius.

Second. Dion Cassius, being independent of Marius Maximus, may be used to corroborate statements made by Aelius Spartianus, who uses Maximus as his source.

Third. Statements in regard to the same fact found in Victor's 'Epitome' and in the first half of Spartian's 'Vita Caracallae'

¹ Phil. Sup. B. IV, p. 372.

² L. I., p. 432.

³ Teuffel-Schwabe-Warr, 414, 3.

⁴ ἀπάρας δὲ τῆς Ἰταλίας, ἐπὶ τε ταῖς ὀχθαῖς τοῦ Ἰστροῦ γενόμενος, διώκει δὴ τὰ ἀρκτῶα τῆς ἀρχῆς μέρη. 'Ab Excessu Divi Marci,' IV 7, 2.

have probably but one unit value because they are derived from the same source.

Of the monumental sources, the 'Acta Arvalium' give us a number of definite chronological points from which to start our calculations. The coins, likewise, by the dates of a 'profectio' or 'adventus,' are equally firm as points of vantage. The conclusion as to the presence of the emperor on roads which he is given the credit of building or restoring is only presumptive and can be used simply as corroborative evidence to help out a cumulative argument. The testimony of the health-coins is also of value only as one of the elements of cumulative proof.

The interrelation of the sources and their value as corroborative of parts of the suspected text may be shown by the graphical outline on the opposite page.

The Problems.

By the death of Septimius Severus at York, Feb. 14, 211, Caracalla and his brother Geta came to the imperial throne. The brothers immediately returned from Britain to Rome by way of Gaul. Caracalla brought about the murder of Geta, Feb. 27, 212, thus becoming sole emperor, forestalling possible opposition to himself by the murder of a large number of Geta's friends. At this point Chap. V begins: "His gestis Galliam petit atque ut primum in eam venit, Narbonensem proconsulem occidit.

2. cunctis deinde turbatis, qui in Gallia res gerebant, odium tyrannicum metuit, quamvis aliquando fingeret et benignum, cum esset natura truculentus.

3. et cum multa contra homines et contra iura civitatum fecisset, morbo implicitus graviter laboravit. circa eos, qui eum curabant, crudelissimus fuit.

4. dein ad orientem profectionem parans omisso itinere in Dacia resedit. circa Retiam non paucos barbaros interemit militesque suos quasi Syllae milites et cohortatus est et donavit.

5. <Deorum sane se nominibus appellari vetuit, quod Commodus fecerat, cum illi eum, quod leonem aliasque feras occidisset Herculem dicerent.

6. et cum Germanos subegisset, Germanum se appellavit vel ioco vel serio, ut erat stultus et demens, adserens, si Lucanos vicisset, Lucanicum se appellandum.>

7. <Damnati sunt eo tempore qui urinam in eo loco fecerunt, in quo statuæ aut imagines erant principis, et qui coronas imagi-

nibus eius detraxerunt, ut alias ponerent, damnatis et qui remedia quartanis tertianisque collo adnexa gestarunt.>

8. Per Thracias cum praef. praet. iter fecit. inde cum in Asiam traiceret, naufragii periculum adit antemna fracta, ita ut in scfam cum protectoribus vix descenderet. unde in triremem a praef. classis receptus evasit.

9. <Excepit apros frequenter, contra leonem etiam stetit. quo etiam missis ad amicos litteris gloriatus est seque ad Herculis virtutem accessisse iactavit.>

In the enumeration of events of this period the reference to Dacia is apparently out of order, both chronologically and topographically. Drexler¹ comments on this as follows: "Die Darstellung wird unklar gemacht hauptsächlich durch die Erwähnung von dem Gemetzel unter den Barbaren in der Nähe von Rhätien, nachdem vorher die Ankunft des Herrschers in Dacien berichtet worden ist. Der Autor hat hier jedenfalls neben seiner gewöhnlichen Quelle noch eine zweite benutzt und aus ihr diese Erzählung, die wie wir oben sahen, in das Jahr 213, in den Anfang des Alamannenkrieges zu setzen ist, eingerückt." As I base some rather important conclusions on this transposition of the text, I think a fuller consideration of how it probably occurred is desirable. Spartianus was using Marius Maximus and some other source, probably Enmann's 'Verlorene Geschichte.' His method was the rudest possible. In place of assimilating the knowledge gained from his sources and presenting the results in his own language, he probably simply excerpted from one at a time and inserted as he went along the extra statements found in his second source. We have good reason for believing that the reference to Dacia was not found in the work of Marius Maximus. In Dion Cassius, LXXVII 16, 6, we find the statement: *ὅτι ἐς τὴν Θράκην ἀφίκετο ὁ Ἀντωνῖνος, μηδὲν ἔτι τῆς Δακίας φροντίσας.* Dion and Marius are contemporaneous original authorities for the events of this year. Dion speaks of the stay in Dacia in slighting terms. It is of so little importance that Marius Maximus passes it without mention; but Spartianus, finding it in his second source, incorporates it in his account and by mistake inserts it in the wrong place. The mistake consists then, not in getting an event of the year 213 in the account of the year 214, as Drexler implies, but an account of an event of 214 or the latter part of 213 is taken from a second source and inserted out of its order in the

¹ Drexler's 'Caracalla's Zug nach dem Orient.' Halle, 1880, S. 10, Anm. 2.

account, by Marius Maximus, of the early part of the year 213. The reference to Dacia should immediately precede the one to Thrace, as is shown by Dion's account,¹ coming after paragraphs 6 and 7, 'Vita Car.' [bracketed by Peter], immediately before paragraph 8.

The parts of this chapter that need particular investigation are first, 1 and 3; namely, that Caracalla went to Gaul and was ill there; second, paragraph 6, that he called himself Germanus. The former is dismissed by Schiller² in the terse expression "Falsch ist die Erzählung V, 1." The latter is inclosed by Peter in the form of parenthesis,³ which indicates that the text is especially corrupt. Let us consider them in their order. To draw the issue sharply, I present them in the form of problems.

Problem 1: To establish the authenticity of Chap. V, par. 1 and 3. Schiller apparently throws out the 'Galliam petit' as one of the haphazard statements so characteristic of the 'Scriptores.' It is the only passage in the literature referring to Caracalla's detour into Gaul on his way to Germany, unless we consider that Aurelius Victor⁴ refers to the same thing: "At cum e Gallia vestem plurimam devexisset, . . . de nomine huiusce vestis Caracalla cognominatus est." Schiller may consider that the two passages are derived from the same source and therefore have but one unit value, or that the passage in Victor means that Caracalla brought the robe from Gaul on his way home from England with Geta, in 211. Duruy⁵ says: "Toward the end of the year 212 Caracalla went to Gaul. . . . In February, 213, he was back again in his capital, which he beheld for the last time." Hertzberg⁶: "Diese deutsche Gruppe [the Alamanni] war es, auf welche Caracalla als auf neue und höchst kraftvolle Feinde stiess, als er i. J. 213 n. Chr. über Aquileja durch die Provinz Noricum nach der Donau und dann von Rätien aus nach Oberdeutschland und Gallien sich bewegte." Eckhel⁷: "In Gallias hoc anno [213], aut forte exeunte superiore proficiscitur, eaque atrociter

¹ *Historia Romana*, LXXVII 16.

² *Die Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, I 2, S. 743, Anm. 5.

³ *S. H. A.*, Praefatio, xxxiii.

⁴ *Epitome*, XXI 2.

⁵ *History of Rome*. Victor Duruy. Ed. by Rev. J. P. Mahaffy. Vol. VI, p. 250.

⁶ *Geschichte des röm. Kaiserreiches*. G. F. Hertzberg. Allg. Gesch. II 1, p. 519.

⁷ *Doct. Num. Vet.* VII, p. 209.

vexata in urbem revertitur." I shall prove that Schiller is wrong in throwing out the passage, that Hertzberg is mistaken in regard to his route and that Duruy and Eckhel are confused in their chronology and in the movements of Caracalla in 212 and 213.

I take as the basis of my argument the text of the Scriptor. The burden of proof must rest on the one who asserts the falsity of the text. If I can furnish corroborative evidence of reasonable certainty for the statement of Spartianus, my position is established. The last date we have in the Life of Caracalla is February, 212.¹ The evidence as to how he occupied himself from this time until he started on the German expedition is mainly inferential. We may assume that the proscription of his enemies extended over a considerable time. Dion says² the number of the proscribed amounted to twenty thousand. Then from these murders he turned himself to the giving of games,³ which he celebrated with great magnificence. The Liberalitas VII⁴ belongs to this period. Also the formation and equipment of his Macedonian phalanx.⁵ The building of the Circus of Caracalla probably belongs here, though the dedication occurred in the beginning of the following year.⁶ The famous edict⁷ extending citizenship to all inhabitants of the Roman Empire, thus increasing the number of taxpayers on manumissions, legacies and donations, was probably designed to meet the increased expenditure on the army and people at this time. There seems to be enough in all this to occupy his time fully for the remainder of the year 212.

For the year 213 we have some numismatic evidence as to his movements. Cohen⁸ gives two coins with PROFECTIONE AUG. on the reverse, which he dates 213. That these can not have been struck late in 213 is shown by the absence of the Germanicus title on the face, which we know was given in October⁹ of this year. It seems probable that the dedication of the Circus of

¹ Cagnat: 'Cours d'Épigraphie Latine,' p. 192: "Geta meurt le 27? février 212."

² 'Hist. Rom.' LXXVII 4, 1.

³ Ibid. LXXVII 6, 2.

⁴ Eckhel: 'Doct. Num. Vet.' VII 209; Cohen: 'Description des Monnaies,' Car. 133.

⁵ Dion Cassius: 'Hist. Rom.' LXXVII 7, 1.

⁶ Cohen: Car. 236, 237.

⁷ Digest, I, 5, 17.

⁸ 'Description des Monnaies,' Car. 508, 509.

⁹ CIL. VI 1, 2086, p. 550.

Caracalla would not occur in his absence. Cohen¹ gives two coins referring to that event, with the reverse IMP II. COS IIII. Caracalla was consul for the fourth time, Jan. 1, 213.² He became emperor for the third time, Oct. 6, 213.³ If, then, the dedication of the circus preceded his departure from the city, we may place the latter after Jan. 1, 213. Nisle's⁴ statement that the 'profectio' occurred in 212, and Eckhel's⁵ and Duruy's⁶ hypothesis that he left in 212 but returned in 213, may be met by the argument that either assumption is unnecessary to explain his movements. Nisle is trying to avoid the hypothetical difficulty of getting Caracalla through the mountains to his position in Germany as early in the season as we know he was there. This difficulty is, however, fully met by taking him along the Riviera route. Duruy⁶ makes the assumption because he thinks Caracalla must have been in Rome as late as Feb. 5, 213, in order to issue the edict of that date from the city. This, however, is disproved by Nisle,⁷ who cites edicts of 215 and 216, issued at Rome in the name of Caracalla, at which time we know he was in the East. I take, therefore, as the time at which he left Rome, the earliest date at which the weather would allow him to move an army. Let us assume the middle of February. This may be too early. Certainly it could not be much earlier.

There is at the present time some epigraphic evidence that Duruy, Schiller, Hertzberg and Eckhel did not possess (vol. XII of the Corpus appeared in 1888, after their works were issued). CIL. XII 5430, 31, 32 are inscriptions on a series of milestones in southeastern Gallia Narbonensis, not far from Vence (Vintium). The first has an almost perfect inscription, the others are easily restored by comparison with it; i. e. they belong to the same series.⁸ CIL. XII 5430 is given in the 'Graphical Outline of Sources,' Group I, b, p. 45.

¹ 'Description des Monnaies,' Car. 236, 237.

² Cagnat: 'L'Épigraphie Latine,' p. 191; cf. Klein: 'Fast. Cons.,' p. 93.

³ CIL. VI 1, 2086, p. 550.

⁴ 'De Bellis ab Antonino Caracalla in Germania et Sarmatia Gestis Annis 212-214,' Paulus Nisle, 1866, p. 2.

⁵ See above, p. 47.

⁶ 'Hist. of Rome,' vol. VI, p. 250; cf. note 6. Momm. dates this 214.

⁷ 'De Bellis Gestis Annis 212-214,' p. 25. Annotatio I.

⁸ Nos. 5434-36 also are believed to belong to this series. Cf. CIL. XII 5434, 5435, 5436.

The inscription is dated¹ by the COS IIII and the absence of the GERMANICVS in the title. The stones were set up after January 1, 213, and, at the latest, before October 6 of the same year. I shall show later that the Germanicus of May is a pseudo-title, but that the milestones were probably set up before this earlier date. CIRh. 1962 gives an inscription of the same class; i. e. with COS IIII but no GERMANICVS. It was found near the village of Steinbach in Baden. The milestone on which it occurs was erected by Civitas Aquensis (Baden-Baden) four Gallic leugae from Baden-Baden.

It was customary to make elaborate preparation for the visit of an emperor. Dion says² that even magnificent houses were built for Caracalla along the road; *a fortiori*, may we conclude that the roads would be repaired for him. The milestones, then, are strong presumptive evidence that Caracalla passed over the roads soon after they were repaired. The stones themselves say they were set up in the early part of the year 213. Why didn't he go direct to his objective point in Germany, as Nisle claims? On so important an expedition he would start betimes in the spring. We have already assumed the middle of February. It does not snow along the Riviera—rarely at least—I am told. But the road through mountain-passes, even a Roman road, would be impassable in the early spring. The reason for the detour is obvious.

We are able to fix three points on Caracalla's route. Two from the milestones above described, the third from the text. "Narbonensem proconsulem occidit," says Spartianus.³ This murder probably occurred at the chief city of the province, Vienne. The three points for the determination of our irregular curve are then: a point on the road branching from Via Aurelia in S. E. Gallia Narbonensis, passing through Vintium; second, Vienne; third, a point four Gallic miles S. W. of Baden-Baden.

The stones in Gallia Narbonensis are not on the main road, the Via Aurelia, but on a branch running N. W. from the Via Aurelia at Cagnes. It will, therefore, be necessary to consider the probable route taken by Caracalla from Rome to Germany. He would certainly leave Rome by the Via Aurelia and follow

¹ See p. 47, notes 2 and 3.

² Hist. Rom. LXXVII 9, 6.

³ Vit. Car. V 1.

the southern route into Gaul. As this takes him a roundabout course, and as we know approximately the time he reached the neighborhood of Baden-Baden, the intervening distance must be carefully calculated.

Route of Caracalla from Rome to the German Frontier.

	Roman miles.
From Rome to Varus Flumen,	587
“ Var. Fl. to Cagnes (measured),	3
“ Cagnes to Vintium (measured),	5
“ Vintium to Salinae (measured),	39
“ Salinae to Bauduen,	36
“ Bauduen to Reii (measured),	10
“ Reii to Manosque (measured),	18
“ Manosque to Point on Brigantium-Arelate road (measured),	11
“ above Point to Cabellio,	40
“ Cabellio to Avennio (measured),	15
Total,	767
“ Avennio to Vienne,	125
“ Vienne to Geneva,	100
“ Geneva to Argentoratum,	267
Grand total,	1256

I have taken it for granted in working out this route that Caracalla would in all instances take the shortest road that was passable at this time of year; i. e. late winter or early spring. I have, therefore, always used the ancient itinerary that gives the shortest route.

The distance from Rome to Varus Flumen is taken from the *Itinerarium Antonini*.¹ All distances not given in the itineraries are measured on Kiepert's map,² in CIL. XII. In regard to the road from Vintium to Reii, Hirschfeld makes the following statement³: “*Viae Vintio vel potius infra Vintium a vico St. Jean prope Cagnes sito Salinas atque inde Reios ducentis in itinerariis mentio fit nulla; lapides autem miliarii in hac regione reperti viam ibi ab Antonino Severi filio et postea imperatorum Maximini Probi Constantini iussu restitutam miliaque usque ad Salinas a Vintio, inde a Salinis numerata esse ostendunt.*” The existence of a road from Salinae to Bauduen is proved by the discovery of a

¹ *Itinerarium Antonini*. Edd. Parthey et Pinder, pp. 139-41.

² CIL. XII, Tab. I. ‘Gallia Narbonensis a Sinistra Rhodani.’

³ CIL. XII, p. 632, I Vintio Reios.

milestone¹ of the time of Antoninus Pius with the numeral XXXVI upon it. The editor comments on this as follows: "Bauduen a Reii distat chiliom. 12, a Salinis recta regione triginta, sed viam valde montuosam fortasse plus quinquaginta chiliometrorum longitudinem habuisse Kiepertus existimat; videntur igitur milia a Salinis numerata esse." From Reii to Aquae Sextiae we have a route on an ancient itinerary,² but, if this were taken, the distance from Cagnes to Aquae Sextiae would be 134³ Roman miles, whereas by the Via Aurelia it is only 107.⁴ As the route by way of Vintium would hardly have been taken except to save distance, we are obliged to find some shorter way for getting back to the main road, further along its course. The route from Reii to Aquae Sextiae⁵ is not given on the Kiepert map, but it evidently ran along the valley of a branch of the Durance. We have the remains of a milestone⁶ of Tiberius, found at Manosque between the branch of the Durance and the main road leading out of Arelate⁷ toward the Alps, showing that at some time a connecting road existed between the Reii-Aquae Sextiae road and the one from Arelate to Brigantium. From Reii to Manosque by this route would be about 18 miles. From Manosque to the Arelate-Brigantium road, in a straight line, the distance is eleven Roman miles. This line strikes the main road about ten miles from Alaunium. The distance from this intersection to Cabellio is 40 miles (50—10).⁸ Kiepert gives a hypothetical route direct from Cabellio to Avennio,⁹ where we again reach the main road.

The total distance by the route described, from Rome to Avennio, is 767 Roman miles. The distance by the ordinary route is 817 Roman miles¹⁰; i. e. Rome to Arelate, 796; Arelate to Avennio, 21.

The distance from Avennio to Argentoratum by way of Vienne and Geneva is given in the itineraries,¹¹ making a grand total of 1256 Roman miles. The distance from this point to the place where he slaughtered the Germans I have not attempted to

¹ CIL. XII 5453.

² 'Table de Peutinger.' Desjardin. 'Geographie de la Gaule,' IV 158.

³ 5 + 39 + 36 + 10 (see Table, p. 51) + 44. (Desjardin, IV 158.)

⁴ 'Itin. Ant.,' pp. 141, 142.

⁵ Desjardin, l. c.

⁶ CIL. XII 5496.

⁷ 'Itin. Ant.,' 162-4.

⁸ 'Itin. Ant.,' p. 163.

⁹ CIL. XII, Tab. I.

¹⁰ 'Itin. Ant.,' pp. 139-42; Desjardin: 'Tab. de Peut.' IV 150.

¹¹ Desjardin: 'Tab. de Peut.' IV 150 and 153; 'Itin. Ant.,' 166.

calculate, as the exact location is unknown. I shall later, in my account of his movements, estimate this as about two days' journey for an army.

We have found the statement of Spartianus confirmed by the evidence of the coins and by the inscriptions on the milestones. Have we attained our desired reasonable certainty? No; only a fair probability. In the first place, we have been working on the assumption that the inscribed milestones just off the Via Aurelia indicated the existence of a continuous road through to the main road at Avenio. Although this is established by first-hand authorities or by reasonable conjecture based on such authorities, nevertheless it has only the value of a conjectural restoration. In the second place, the milestones might have been set up at the date indicated and the same inscription put on them even though Caracalla were not expected to pass by them.¹ Our corroborative evidence has not yet sufficient cumulative force. We must go further.

The text continues²: "*proconsulem Narbonensem occidit.*" This statement I have not tried to prove. It is not improbable. The most likely place for it to occur was at the chief city of Gallia Narbonensis; i. e. Vienne, whither the route which we have established must take him. This is only negative evidence, but certainly does not diminish the value of our fair probability already established.

The text says further³: "*morbo implicitus etc.*" If Spartian's statement as to what occurred in Gaul after Caracalla arrived there can be proved, it exalts our fair probability above established to a reasonable certainty. To prove the illness I turn to the coins, first looking for an Aesculapius. But Eckhel says⁴ Apollo, Serapis and Hercules were also regarded by Caracalla as health-gods; consequently, coins struck in honor of any one of these gods are to be considered as referring to his health. For the years 213/14 Cohen⁵ gives the coins included in the subjoined table, classified according to the significance of the reverses.

¹ CIL. XII 6854 shows an inscription of the same class found near Anxur, dated 216, at which time we know Car. was in the East.

² *Vita Car.* V 1.

³ *Ibid.* V 3.

⁴ *Doctrina Numorum Veterum*, VII, p. 212.

⁵ *Description des Monnaies*, IV, Caracalla.

	213		214	
Aesculapius,			[245] ¹	1
Apollo,			[242]	1
Hercules,	[220-222]	3	[244]	1
Serapis,	[211-215]	5	[241]	1
		<hr/>		<hr/>
Total health-coins,		8		4
Victory,			[267-269]	3
Vict. Germanica,	[645, 646]	2		
Caracalla and Victory,	[233, 234]	2	[271, 272]	2
Mars and Victory,	[217-219]	3	[254-259]	6
Rome and Victory,			[246, 264-266]	4
Mars,	[151, 216]	2	[260-262]	3
		<hr/>		<hr/>
Total victory coins,		9		18
Juppiter,	[107]	1	[239]	1
Pluto,			[240, 253]	2
Neptune,			[238]	1
Diana,			[263]	1
Temple of Vesta,			[249-251]	3
Profectio,	[508, 509]	2		
Caracalla,	[232]	1	[247, 248, 270]	3
Adlocutio,			[252, 273-275]	4
Elephant,	[230]	1		
Circus of Caracalla,	[236, 237]	2		
Liberalitas,	[134-136]	3	[137-139]	3
Moneta,	[166]	1		
Libertas,	[223-229]	7		
Providentia,	[536-540]	5		
Securitas,	[579]	1		
Concord. Milit.,	[25]	1		
		<hr/>		<hr/>
Total unclassified,		25		18

The large number of coins given by Cohen with dates 210-213 and 213-217 I have not considered because of the uncertainty in regard to the particular year. We know, too, that the Aesculapius coins after 214 must refer not to any particular restoration to

¹The bracketed numbers refer to Cohen: 'Description des Monnaies,' 'Caracalla.'

health, but to Caracalla's visit to a temple of the god, at Pergamos, in the latter part of this year.¹

Of the significant coins for 213, the largest number (9) refers to the great victory over the Germans that was occupying so important a place in the public mind. The next largest number (8) refers to his health. Many of the coins of the list marked unclassified may be referred to specific events of this year. The 'Profectio' and 'Circus of Caracalla,' for example, have already been explained.² The large number of 'Libertas' coins [223-229] I can not account for. The significance of the list lies in the fact of the relatively large preponderance of the references to his health in the coins of this year.

I include in the classification the coins of 214 because we may assume that the most of these were struck in the winter of 213-214 after Caracalla returned to Rome.³ The relatively smaller number of health-coins of this year as compared with the victory coins (4 to 18, in 214, as against 8 to 9, in 213) seems significant. The rejoicing in his victory would become more pronounced and thanks for his restoration to health less so, in proportion as we recede from the time of his illness.

Although this gives a respectable showing on the statistical basis, I think it would not be of great value except for the fact that it is confirmed by the direct statement of Dion Cassius. The Epitomist, quoting from Dion, says⁴: ὅτι τὸν Ἀντωνῖνον ἔκφρονα καὶ παραπλήγα αἱ τῶν πολεμίων ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐπεποίηκεσαν· ἀκούοντες γὰρ τινες τῶν Ἀλαμαννῶν ἔφασαν ὅτι μαγγανείαις τισὶν ἐπ' ἐκπλήξει τῶν φρενῶν αὐτοῦ κέχρηται. Dion gives this immediately after his account of the German campaign. He himself may have heard some of the Germans make this statement about their cruel conqueror. It is highly probable that this refers to the acute illness mentioned by Spartianus as occurring just before the German campaign began. The fair probability established above by connecting the milestone inscriptions with the 'Galliam petit' of the text has now reached the dignity of the desired reasonable certainty. The text is vindicated.

I insert a little calculation as to times and distances. Cara-

¹ Herodian, IV 8.

² Cf. p. 48.

³ Drexler: 'Caracalla's Zug nach dem Orient,' S. 8-10. Nisle: 'De Bellis Gestis, etc.' p. 16. Caracalla's Trib. Pot. XVIII began Dec. 11, 213. Cf. Egbert: 'Latin Inscriptions,' p. 136.

⁴ 'Hist. Rom.' LXXVII 15, 2.

calla left Rome, February 14, 213.¹ He marched by way of the Via Aurelia into Gallia Narbonensis. He left the main road at Cagnes² to make the shorter cut across Gallia Narbonensis. This route took him to Vienne, where the murder of the proconsul probably occurred. He was ill there for some days or weeks. Thence he marched to a point near Baden-Baden along the route on which the German milestones are found. From Rome to Argentoratum by this route is 1278 Roman miles.³ With an army he could move 20⁴ Roman miles a day. The entire journey would take 64 days. Thence to the point where the murder of the Germans occurred I have estimated at two days' journey. Total in round numbers, 66 days. Starting from Rome Feb. 14, he could have reached his objective point by continuous marching on April 21. If we allow him three weeks for his illness in Gaul, he will reach this point May 12. We leave him there for a time and pass to the consideration of the next problem.

Problem 2 (a): To remove the parenthesis from paragraph 6, Vita Caracallae, V: <et cum Germanos subegisset, Germanum se appellavit vel ioco vel serio ut erat stultus et demens, adserens, si Lucanos vicisset, Lucanicum se appellandum>.

(b) To explain the discrepancy in the Arval Protocols for 213.⁵

Peter⁶ makes the following statement in regard to the use of the brackets <—> of the standard text: "denique eas adnotationunculas, quae aliunde alienis locis inspersae sunt, ut tenorem orationis saepe molestissime turbent (cf. Phil., l. s., p. 157 sq.),⁷ his <—> distinxi." The discrepancy that needs consideration in the 'Acta Arvalium'⁸ is that in the record for May 20 there is a GERMANICVS but no IMP⁹ in the title of Caracalla. In the record for August 11 there is neither a GERMANICVS nor an IMPERATOR. In the October 6 record there is GERMANICVS IMP III. Mommsen's¹⁰ explanation for this is as follows: "mihi creditur ominis loco factum esse propter bellum

¹ See above, p. 49.

² Cf. p. 50.

³ See Table, p. 51.

⁴ Vegetius: 'Epit. Rei Militaris,' I 9.

⁵ CIL. VI 1, 2086, p. 550. Cf. 'Graphical Outline of Sources,' p. 45.

⁶ Praefatio, p. xxxiii, 'S. H. A.' Ed. Hermannus Peter.

⁷ Phil. XLIII, p. 158: "Fremde zusätze (oder ungeschickte excerpte?) haben wir c. 4, 11; c. 5, 5; 7 (zu c. 4 gehörig) und 9."

⁸ See 'Graph. Outline,' p. 45, Group II, b.

⁹ That is, not one significant of a victory. Cf. Mommsen: 'Römisches Staatsrecht,' II 2, 781.

¹⁰ 'Eph. Epig.' I, 134, N. 4.

mox patrandum et fortasse iam tum coeptum." Schiller¹ in his comment on this says: "Eine solche Anwendung bleibt unter allen Umständen auffällig; ich halte sie aber hier für unzulässig, weil nach 'Germanice maxime di te servant' folgt: 'Britannice maxime di te servant'; möglicherweise wurde diese Benennung erst bei der Abfassung der Protokolle eingesetzt, mit der man gewartet hatte, bis die Entscheidung gefallen war." Mommsen's explanation seems to be thrown out as a by-the-way conjecture to explain a little difficulty that has no bearing upon the question he is then considering. As regards Schiller's explanation, it may be said that it does not go to the bottom of the difficulty, because the real question is, Why is he called Germanicus at the May meeting, not given the title at the August meeting, then given the GERMANICVS IMP III at the October meeting? Holländer comes close to indicating where the difficulty is and to giving a solution of it, but does not (so far as I can make out from Drexler's² excerpts of his thesis) seem to see that there is a difficulty. Mommsen and Schiller fail to elucidate it by missing entirely the significant statement of Spartianus. But, read the text that Peter³ considers corrupt and the solution is a simple one. The argument, as in Problem 1, rests on the text as a basis. "<et cum Germanos subegisset, Germanum se appellavit vel ioco vel serio, ut erat stultus et demens, adserens, si Lucanos vicisset, Lucanicum se appellandum.>"

Caracalla, in his hunger for military renown, would like to make capital out of the massacre described by Dion, LXXVII 13.⁴ He then makes the remark attributed to him in the bracketed text. It is significant that it reads 'Germanum⁵ se appellavit,' and not 'appellatus est.' It was not given by the army but was assumed, half in jest, half in earnest, by the emperor. There is no reason to doubt this on the face of it. It is just such a remark as would be treasured up by the attendants of an emperor. It must have been made about an unimportant incident. He would

¹ 'Gesch. der röm. Kaiserzeit,' I 2, S. 743, Anm. 5.

² Drexler's 'Caracalla's Zug,' S. 8.

³ Cf. notes 2 and 3, p. 55.

⁴ Cf. Drexler, S. 8.

⁵ M. gives 'Germanicum.' That this is the meaning is plain from the use of 'Lucanicum.' Possibly the 'Germanum' refers to the fact that he has treated the Germans just as he did his 'frater Germanus, Geta.'

not have said such a thing jocosely about an important engagement, because he was very greedy of military titles.¹

We left Caracalla near Baden-Baden,² May 12, 213. We find him now 'circa Rhaetiam.'³ The milestones here show that he was moving from Strassburg toward Rhaetia. The distance from here to Rome by the shortest route⁴ is 793 Roman miles. News would travel by post⁵ at the rate of 120 miles a day, traveling continuously. The little imperial jest would reach the capital in time for a regular meeting of the Arvals on May 20. This sycophantic body, acting on Caracalla's playful suggestion, call him Germanicus at this time, and this is incorporated in the record of May 20.

It was not, however, an official title given by the army or senate, and at the meeting in August, when there was a really important campaign begun, they neglected the pseudo-title and confined themselves to prayers for the success of the emperor's expedition.

When the great victory was won later in the summer [I do not stop to prove the occurrence or the importance of this because there is no dispute in regard to it] Caracalla was greeted by his army as GERMANICVS IMP III, the news was carried to Rome, the senate confirmed the title, and then, when the Arvals met, on October 6, they burst into a paeon of thanksgiving for the safety and German victory of their Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Pius Felix Augustus Parthicus Maximus *Germanicus* Maximus Pontifex Maximus in his sixteenth tribunicial power, his third imperatorship, fourth consulate, etc.

The parenthesis should be removed.

The discrepancy in the Arval Records is apparent, not real.

JOSEPH H. DRAKE.

¹ CIL. XII 5430, N. [... pontificatus maximus passim omittitur ... possibile adeo conicere ipsi imperatori placuisse ut miles magis videretur quam sacerdos Th. M.].

² See above, p. 56.

³ 'Vit. Car.' V 4.

⁴ 'Itin. Anton.' 57 and 167, 8.

⁵ Friedländer: 'Sittengeschichte Roms,' II, S. 17.

IV.—CORRECTIONS OF SCHMALZ'S LATEINISCHE SYNTAX AND LATEINISCHE STILISTIK.

The merits of these two works from the pen of Schmalz are too well known to call for any extended remark here. Each is a marvel of condensation. Within the brief compass of 146 pages he has presented a vast amount of interesting and valuable information in regard to the historical development of Latin syntax, covering not only the incipency and growth of every important Latin construction, but also the individual peculiarities of expression of almost all the great writers of Latin literature. Within the narrow limits of 53 pages he has performed a similar service in the domain of Latin style. Each is an epitome of the results of preceding scholars in these fields, corrected and enriched by the author's own personal investigations. Works of such vast scope one could hardly expect to be entirely free from errors. Nor would it, furthermore, be right to expect that in a 'Handbuch' the individual peculiarities of every writer could be chronicled. The wonder is that the characteristic usage of so many writers has been observed and recorded.

The object of this paper is to point out some errors that have been made and to call attention to some important omissions, the writer having recourse to the *marginalia* of his own edition.

§39. Sisenna's usage of the form *assentio* is also referred to by Quint. I 5. 13: "Sisenna dixit 'adsentio' multique et hunc et analogian secuti." (See also IX 3. 6.)

§54. For names of countries in the acc., limit of motion, he says, by Plaut. only Capt. 571 (573 in Goetz and Schoell), but Curc. Arg. 1 has *it Cariam* (but 67 and 438 *in Cariam*). Add also the examples Sall. Jug. 28 and Cic. Pomp. 34 (concinny?).

Anm. 2. Ablative duration of time; cf. Plaut. Bacch. 2: "Annis viginti errans a patria afuit." Cf. also Suet. Caes. 59; Seneca, Epist. XVIII 1. 28; Mart. IX 67. 1; XI 77. 2; XII 65. 1; Petron., §III. (An interesting temporal expression is found in Quint. VI 3. 73: "triginta se annos habere." Cf. the Romance construction.)

§61. For the use of *celare*, add Ter. Phorm. 959: "Neque iam id celare posse te uxorem tuam."

§65, Anm. 2. Wrong reference to Lorenz's note; cf. Mil. Gl. 1434 instead of 1422.

§70. Here the statement is made that the construction of a preposition with a neut. pron. and genitive begins with Sall., but Ter. Phorm. 979 already uses it: "In id redactus sum loci." Further: "eo scientiae progredi" occurs in Quint. II 1. 6, and "eo dementiae" in IX 2. 90.

§72. To examples cited add Quint. I 10. 29, *caecus animi*; for *impos* add Prud. Cath. 9. 53, and Psychom. 585; for *incertus* add Stat. Theb. 5. 525; Pliny, Ep. IX 13. 11; Bell. Afr. 7; Curt. VIII 10. 27 (Val. Flacc. III 602 has the abl.). Quint. IV 3. 8 has *certus sententiae*.

Anm. 1. On the use of *studiosus* it should be noted that Plaut. Mil. Gl. 802 has the dative. [Lorenz and Brix, *ad loc.*, say that *studiosus* with a dat. occurs only here; but cf. Ov. Met. VII 675, and a possible example in Prud. Peristeph. IV 54, where Obbarius, following some of the MSS, has a dative (*Christo*). (What does the Archiv, IV 161, mean in denying *studiosus* to Plautus?)]

§85. Schmalz says that the earliest example of a "Dativus Iudicantis" occurs in Caes. Bell. Civ., but Varro, L. L. V 57, has "a foro eunti est." He says that only Verg. and Ov. of the poets use this construction; but cf. Stat. II 224.

§87, Anm. 1. He says that "*Fieri* is not found with a predicate dative"; but cf. Cic. Har. resp. 44: "cui tribuno pl. non licuit." (Cf. further my treatment of the predicate dative in the Archiv, XI (1898), p. 21 et seq., and Am. Journ. Phil. XIX, p. 215.)

§89. To the examples of the locative dative add Plaut. Capt. 692: "te Morti (Bx. *morti*) misero."

§96. Schmalz says that *ab* with the comparative occurs first in Porphyrio; but cf. Vitruv. VI 3. 5.

§99, Anm. 2. *Fruor* with the acc. also occurs in Afran., frag. 390 (Ribb.).

§100. *Egere* with the genitive occurs 3 times in Quint.: II 16. 13; 8. 63; V 14. 5; but 23 times with the abl. (I 1. 27; 2. 12; 6. 38; 41; 8. 4; II 11. 1, etc.). Martial has the ablative 3 times to the gen. once (VI 25. 7 *rationis egentes*).

Anm. *Plenus*: Quint. IX 3. 1 remarks that the abl. is the usual construction of his own time, but that earlier the gen. was used. He himself uses the abl. 4 times (II 8. 3; IX 3. 16; 4. 136, and XII 10. 60), but the gen. 6 times (IV 2. 75; IX 2. 10; 4. 109; X 1. 44; 96, and XI 1. 34). Prud. also uses both constructions,

the gen. in Per. IV 5 and Psych. 769, and the abl. in Cath. VII 60; Per. I 100; II 542; Apoth. 790 and Psych. pr. 26. Ambrose has the gen. in De Noe 9. 28 and De Off. III 12. 81.

§102. Add the further examples of Livy 22. 1. 9; Val. Max. 1. 6. 5; Flor. 2. 6. 9 *caelo missa*; Quint. 1. 6. 16 *demissa caelo*.

Anm. 2. Cf. Livy 24. 6 Carthagine; Caes. B. C. 1. 24 Cremona; Plaut. Asin. 499 Rhodo.

§105. Schmalz says that the form *here* is already found in Plautus. But where? In the passages usually cited, Amph. 514 and Mil. Gl. 73, Goetz and Schoell read *heri*, while Truc. 509 is printed "†ere." (Martial uses both forms—*here*: I 43. 2; III 12. 12; IV 7. 1 and 5; 61. 9, and X 31. 1; but *heri*: I 24. 4 and V 58. 8.) *Ephesi* occurs in Plaut. Bacch. 336, 1047, and Mil. Gl. 648; *Lemni* occurs in Cist. Arg. 7.

§109. Present participle joined to object after verbs of perceiving. In addition to the authors cited by Schmalz this construction was used by Juvenius (cf. Hatfield, Study of Juv., §75) and by Prudentius (cf. Cath. 10. 111; Peristeph. 10. 239; 2. 23; 6. 52; 112).

§110. Schmalz says that Cicero uses only *de*, *post* and *in* with the perfect participle; but cf. Cluent. 23. Vergil has "inter agendum" in Ecl. IX 24.

§123. *Ultra* in a temporal sense; cf. also Livy 22. 43. 7.

§143. *Coram*. Martial uses *coram* 5 times before a noun: V 2. 8; VI 21. 3; VII 88. 4; XI 16. 10 and XII 95. 2; after a noun twice: VII 92. 5 and X 14. 10.

§151. *Clam*. Schmalz says that *clam* is used with an abl. only in Caes. B. C. 2. 32 and B. Afr. 11. 4, but both of these passages are disputed. Lindsay, Lat. Lang., p. 580, §21, says, basing the statement on Langen, Beitr., p. 230, "perhaps never the abl. at any period of Latin." But Macrobius uses it in Praef. 2 and in I 4. 1.

§157. Here occurs the statement, which has been repeated in various quarters a number of times, that *nonne* does not occur in Plautus; cf. Landgraf, note 438 to Reisig's Vorlesungen üb. lat. Spr., p. 302, basing the statement upon A. Spengel, Die Partikel Nonne in Altlatein, München, 1887, and Lorenz to Pseud. 340. Lindsay, however, Lat. Lang., p. 605, §10, says in regard to the usage of Plautus, he "uses *nonne* hardly at all." Plautus uses *nonne* in all at least 8 times, and it may be noted that the bulk of the examples are found in one play, the Amphitruo. The

passages are: Amph. 165, 404, 407, 452, 539, 625; Curc. 552; *non[ne]* occurs in Merc. 62. Terence uses *nonne* almost as often, 6 times: Andr. 869; Haut. 545, 922; Eun. 165, 334 and 736.

§158. *Numne*. The occurrences of this disputed form have been noted by the writer in the Class. Rev. for 1897, p. 348 (translated into Italian for 'La Nostra Scuola,' 1897, p. 203), and five well-established examples added to the three usually called in question.

§161. *Anne* in direct questions—a rare usage—occurs 5 times in Juvenal: IV 78; VII 179; 199; X 207; XV 122. Cf. also Pers. III 39; Mart. VIII 51. 1; Sil. Ital. I 342, and Prud. Symmach. I 400.

§163, Anm. The general use of *i nunc* and *i* with another imperative has been treated by the writer in Am. Journ. Phil. XIX (1898), pp. 59–69.

§178. The combination *-que et* should be cited also for Plautus, Mil. Gl. 1315 and 1347. Brix to the latter passage cites four passages from Plautus and one from Terence.

§187. In citing the writers who use *atqui*, Quint. should be mentioned, who makes use of it 29 times.

§188. *Ceterum*: this is used 23 times by Quint.

§§202 and 203. Quint. uses *igitur* first 16 times and second, or third, 139 times. Similarly he uses *itaque* in the second place 12 times (Neue Formenlehre³, p. 975, says only 6). *Itaque* is also used postpositive by Martial, VIII, praef. (prose).

§205. *Nec non et*. Cf. Archiv, 1897, p. 390, and 8, p. 191; cf. also Sid. Apoll. Carm. 22. 47 and Macr. VII 2. 6. *Nec non etiam* cited only for Varro and African Latinity; cf. also Suet. de Gram. c. 22.

§207. *Verum etiam* is used by Quint. 4 times with *non modo*, 2 times with *non solum* and 2 times with *non tantum*.

§209. *Oportet* is used by Quint. 9 times with the subj. to 72 times with the infin.; on the other hand, *necesse est* is used almost as often with the subj. (38) as with the infin. (42), while *ut*, which is very rare, is used in V 10. 123. The rarer expression *necesse habere* with infin., which belongs especially to the *sermo vulgaris* (Landgraf to Reisig's Vorles., p. 612, note 546, a), is found 4 times in Quint.: III 8. 24; VII 2. 16; 53; and XI 1. 74.

Anm. On *licet* with the indic. cf. Archiv, XI (1898), p. 25.

§215. One would think from the statement here given that *qui* (abl.) was not used after Livy; cf. Prud. Contra Sym. II 523, etc.

§222, a. No examples of *tempto* with the infin. are cited after Quint., but this construction is used 5 times by Juvenecus and 8 times by Prudentius.

§223. The substantival use of the infin. occurs in Quint. XI 1. 7: "totum hoc apte dicere non elecutionis tantum genere constat etc."

§242. For the use of an ind. following *sunt qui* cf. also Sall. Cat. 19 and Quint. XI 3. 55, where, however, a subj. is used in the following line. Hier. generally uses the ind. (Goelzer, p. 356).

§243. *Ut qui*. Quint., who uses this 9 times, should be mentioned (I 2. 19; III 5. 9; V 14. 28; X 1. 55; 57; 74; 2. 13; XI 3. 53; XII 2. 20).

§250. Schmalz says that *quod* causal is not met with in Plautus, but cf. Capt. 350: "experiar fidem fretus ingenio eius, quod me esse scit erga se benevolum."

§253. In §120 Schmalz had said that *propter quod* and *propter quae* is post-classical. In that section and in this one he cites merely the Vulgate, Hier. and Cyprian. *Propter quod* occurs 13 times in Quint. and *propter quae* 5 times. This is noteworthy.

§262. Here the statement is made that *antequam* is found in Old Latin only in Cato, Cael. Antip. and Varro, but cf. also Ter. Hec. 146.

§263. Quintilian's usage of *quamquam* should be noted. He uses the ind. 96 times and the subjunctive 14 times.

§265. Schmalz says that with *quamvis* only the subj. is used by Lucr., but cf. III 403; 705, and IV 426. Quint. also uses the ind.; cf. VIII 6. 73. Elsewhere—in all 25 times—the subj. is used.

§275. The statement is made that *ut cum* occurs only in Quint. X 1. 76; but cf. also VI 3. 9 and XI 2. 30.

§292. *Ubiubi* also occurs in Classical Latin; cf. Livy 42. 57. 12.

§303. Schmalz says that *nisi si* is found in Tac. only in the Ann.; but cf. Ger. 2. 2; Agr. 32. 2. Cicero also uses it in Ph. 2. 287; De Or. II 254, and 330. It is found also in Quint. XII 9. 11.

§305. Schmalz says that *etsi* is wanting in Quint., and the same statement is made by Landgraf in note 427b to Reisig's Vorles. (p. 269) and in the original text of Reisig, §529 (p. 395). Quintilian, however, uses *etsi* 8 times: I proem. 19; 5. 28; II 5. 19; V 13. 3; VII 8. 7; IX 1. 19; 2. 100; XI 3. 18, all, it may be noted, with the ind. except V 13. 3.

§308. *Quin*. The statement is made that Cicero has only once written *quin* with an imperative, but cf. Ros. Com. 9. 25. *Quin corroborative* occurs 6 times in Quint.: V 14. 4; VI 2. 12;

VII 4. 17; VIII 4. 24; IX 2. 31, and XII 10. 51. *Quin etiam* occurs 13 times in Quint.: I 5. 60; II 2. 9; 11. 4; 16. 16; III 1. 5; 5. 13; V 10. 40; X 1. 23; 80; 5. 2; 7. 21; XI 1. 20, and 3. 75. It is common also in Pliny, Epist., Gell. and Suet. *Quin et* is common among the poets Lucr., Prop., Ov., Verg., Hor. and Prud. (It may here be noticed that Quint. uses the phrase *feri non potest ut* in III 3. 14 and V 9. 5.)

§309. *Ut* is used with a comparative 38 times in Quint.

STILISTIK.

§3. Quint. has *in ancipiti* IV 1. 41 and *ex ancipiti* VIII 2. 21, and is fond of such phrases.

§10. *Magis*, the particle used in Spanish Latin (cf. Sittl, Lokal. Versch. d. lat. Spr., p. 175), is always employed by the two Spanish authors, Quint. and Prud.

§11. With the comparative Quint. uses *multo* 27 times and *longe* 4 times; with the superlative, *multo* 3 times to *longe* 20 times. (See, further, my Synt. and Style of Prud., §123 with notes.)

§13. *Magis* with a comparative occurs only 3 times in Plautus (Men. prol. 55; Poen. prol. 83, and Pseud. 320), according to E. Norden, Rhein. Mus. 49, p. 194; but Brix, note to Capt. 644, cites also Stich. 699, Men. 978, Poen. 212; 461, Aul. 422, Mil. 613, Bacch. 500, Stich. 484, Pseud. 220 f.

§23. Quint. also uses *quicumque* as an indefinite pronoun; cf. X 1. 12; 105, and 7. 2.

§26. *Uterque* in the plural; cf. also Lact. Inst. IV 12. 15: *adventus utrosque*.

§28. *Toti* = *omnes*, add also Pliny, N. H. XV 100, and cf. Friedländer to Mart. VI 85. 10, and Wölfflin, Rhein. Mus. 37 (1882), p. 107.

§45, 3 (p. 559). Quint. says *Phalereus Demetrius* only once, X 1. 80, but *Demetrius Phalereus* twice, II 4. 41 and X 1. 33. He says, however, *Halicarnasseus Dionysius*, III 1. 16 and IX 4. 88, and *Atacinus Varro*, X 1. 87. [Similarly he says *Domitius Afer* 11 times to *Afer Domitius* 5 times; *Cornelius Celsus* 10 times to *Celsus Cornelius* once (III 6. 38), but *Pollio Asinius* twice to *Asinius Pollio* once (cf. VI 3. 110; VIII 1. 3 and X 1. 113).]

§82. Quintilian's fondness for asyndeton should be noted.

EMORY B. LEASE.

V.—THE GÂTHAS AS CONSECUTIVE WORDS.

Surely many an eminent Grecian or Latinist would gladly welcome the opportunity of passing his eye leisurely over a literal or, as we might say, even a mechanical reproduction of the consecutive terms in the Gâthas as they appear objectively in what has been so often called these 'celebrated' hymns. And specialists themselves, baffled by intrigues and wearied by the sight of empiricism, might welcome the impressions of minds totally fresh to the subject. They would be interested to hear how the matter strikes eminent novices, as its elements stand plainly before them in the shape of close verbal renderings shorn of all comments.

A fresh glance from without may often penetrate the seeming chaos of congested evidence where the expert is hopelessly toiling with blunted faculties, though manfully determined to do his utmost, if only for the imperilled honour of the theme.

But do any of our great specialists in the other departments imagine for a moment that the literal imitation of the consecutive forms in these so valued strophes is a matter of little difficulty? Yet, strange as it may appear, this is actually the case. The full exegesis of the Gâthas in the light of interpretation (so to call it) presents indeed what has been called the supreme difficulty in Aryan philology, for it consists in determining which one of several ever-varying meanings we shall give to the most prominent words which come repeatedly before us, and the questions which 'pile' themselves up out of the many possibilities of each strophe seem forever impossible of settlement, if for no other reason, then because the ever-abiding jealousies will not allow them to be settled.

On the one hand we had the *ipse dixit* of the distinguished interpreter of Tübingen, and we had him alone. I have seen no translations (of his leading school) made in Germany within the last eighteen years which were not almost unmodified reproductions of Roth's views as delivered in his rarely valued lectures.

Even where the immediate author of the renderings had never been personally one of the great *guru's* pupils. His translations were of course taken down carefully by several different hearers, and often generously circulated from one to the other, so becoming very widely spread outside of the country-town where his University was situated. Some of these notes were kindly offered to me, and, as I need hardly say, thankfully accepted (though somewhat to the chagrin of some others of my fellow-labourers). The striking suggestions of this truly great scholar were indeed modified (in the course of time) as he became more critically acquainted with the Asiatic commentaries. But his impressive personality stands alone on the one side as representing those who would read all Zend as Sanskrit a little, but hardly more than a little, modified.¹ And on the other hand, as against this pre-eminent figure (a great master represented by honourable mouthpieces) stand those who stoutly present all that was vitally sagacious in the lingering hints of tradition which had been purposely ignored as unworthy of being considered, or as too difficult to handle, while the textual forms of the ancient documents themselves on which the battle rages rest severe and simple in their powerful significance.

It may well seem incredible to an 'outsider' that the main elements out of which this so subtle science rears itself should be absolutely accessible to the knowledge of any average intellect. Who could believe, if his eyes did not see it, that one of the most puzzling strophes in the entire Gâthas (puzzling as to which one of two or three simple renderings is the true one) is actually composed of terms, as to the literal translation of which into Sanskrit or Latin there could hardly be a difference of opinion. Yet here it is: this is the Zend text:

*Ashâ kaṭ thvâ dar(e)sâni manaschâ vohû vaêdemano (= -nas)
Gâtûmchâ Ahurâi sevishtâi² Sraoshem Mazdâi
Anâ mâthrâ mazishtem² vâurôimaidi (read vavarôimaidi) khraf-
strâ-hizvâ.*

¹ Whereas I would maintain that as the middle Sanskrit differs from the early, and as the early differs still more from the late, so the Zend differs in meaning from the Sanskrit, as would be natural with a sister-tongue.

² My transliteration is of the simplest possible character; in my dictionary I dispense with it entirely.

And here is its Sanskrit translation¹:

(He) ṛta² kaṭ Tvām darṣānti manas ca³ vasu vedamānas
Gātum ca³ asurāya⁴ ṣavishṭhāya ṣrushṭim (su)-medhase
Anena mantreṇa mahishṭham vevrimahi⁵ (? cp. vavṛmāhe) kra-
vis açilīn (apūṇyān) jihvayā.

Some differences in opinion may be possible, but (errors excepted) hardly upon more than a very few details; and what is true of this strophe is true of the remaining 10 (in the Festgruss).⁶ There do indeed occur hapaxlegomena here and there throughout the Gāthas, and some of them present what may be considered absolutely insolvable problems; but they are not so very frequent; and, moreover, as a matter of course in a certain percentage of occurrences they are found in subordinate places in a sentence, and might actually be left untranslated at times with little loss either to the main meaning, the force, or the definite point. The real trouble with these texts is, as I have already hinted, the facile possibility of differing results which arises from the strange fact that several of the more prominent and frequent terms around which the theme of the Gāthas revolves are used in senses which seem, both at first sight and even later, to differ greatly.

Aside from the multiplicity of meanings to the same word, there occurs in this Y. 28, which I have partly cited, one especially doubtful form—a word which may mean 'well-reaching-its-aim,' or 'pertaining to food'; but as 'food for the eaters' was everywhere a necessity and an object in prayer, what 'well-reaches-its-aim' is not so heterogeneous from it. But beside this, misprints excepted, these literal translations in the other strophes in this Y. 28 are almost an absolute reproduction of the Gāthic terms in a dialect which differs less from the Zend (or from which the

¹ See Roth's Festgruss, pp. 193-4; the accents were purposely struck off to avoid misprinting.

² The identity of ṛta with *asha* is not questioned; possibly *asha* is a relic of *arsha*, and *t* elsewhere becomes *s* or *sh*.

³ Pronounced *cha*.

⁴ Misprinted in the Festgruss (I did not see the proof).

⁵ See Whitney's intens. stem *vevri-*; no forms of opt. middle intens. exist as models; cp. also the 1st pl. med. opt. perf. *vavṛtmahi*.

⁶ They elicited a spontaneous word of thanks from the great Zend-Sanskritist himself, and they have been referred to with much interest by Oldenberg in his Vedic Religion. Bartholomae translated a strophe from Y. 10 in a masterly manner; see his preface in the grammar.

Zend less differs) than do the dialects of Greece, the one from the other.¹ Here is another strophe, Y. 28, 1:

Ahyâ yâsâ nemanhâ ustâna-zastô (= -tas) raf(e)dhrahyâ
Mainyêush² Mazdâ pourvim (read -vyam) speñtahyâ ashâ vispēñg
šyaothnâ
Vanhêush² khratûm mananhô yâ khshnevishâ gēushchâ ruvânem³;

and here is its Sanskrit translation:

Asya yacchâmi (might be yacchâ) namasâ ultânahastas rabhasas
(âtîdasya)
Manyos (he su-)medhas pûrvyam śvântasya řtena viçvân (viç-
vâni (?)) cyâutnâni
Vasos kratum manasas yena khshnavishâ(-ânî) gos ca⁴ âtmânām.⁵

It will be seen that we have only to watch very closely the slight differences in the terminations, to substitute *h* and *ñh* for *s*, and to make the other usual phonetic changes, and our Sanskrit is Zend at once, a mere variation in dialect being present as before.

As my experiment with Y. 28, 1 seemed to have arrested attention, I contributed 'the Sanskrit equivalents of Yasna 44' to the 'Acts' of the last Oriental Congress at Paris, but they will fall in a third volume, and the first has only just appeared. Both Y. 28 in the Festgruss and this were excerpts from exceedingly old private studies made by me (I fear to say how many years ago); but if time can be had for it, I will print the whole mass of the Gâthic texts in the same manner, i. e. in their Sanskrit equivalents as an invaluable help to beginners, while it may continue to interest others.⁶

In the meantime there is nothing modern that can serve this same purpose just at present. Latin is indeed sometimes as good as Sanskrit for the purpose, and of course more accessible; but my Latin verbatims in the Five Zarathushtrian Gâthas are interrupted with correcting extensions, emending the closely imitated

¹ See Oldenberg, Vedic Religion, p. 37 (?).

² Transliterations are of the simplest.

³ Written *urvânem*.

⁴ Pronounced *cha*.

⁵ This *âtmânām*, on which there is no difference of opinion, is the sole word, with perhaps *rabhasas*, which is not a close imitation; the differences are dialectical.

⁶ I have these manuscripts still by me, some of them in a rough condition.

Gāthic forms; and they would harass the non-specialist reader. They are, moreover, supplemented by the production of all the other possible renderings, in the shape of alternative translations for the student. I am indeed getting out an English word-for-word reproduction accompanied with my free-metrical (from the more extended book)¹; and I have some hopes that this may enlighten a larger fragment of the general literary public as to the true state of the facts. But English is a very poor vehicle for quasi-syllabic imitations; Latin, or Sanskrit, alone can show (approximately) the shape of the forms.

I would recommend the general reader to glance over Haug's now long since antiquated (Latin) rendering; for the point which I am now making is the 'simplicity of the body of the consecutive terms in general'; and errors as to conjugational or declensional forms do not affect the question as I am now endeavouring to put it. Or, if one can not dispense with the up-to-date opinions, let my verbatims (encumbered as they are) be resolutely read over without pausing at the reconstructed terminations, the first forms being (as those of Haug were) meant to be attempts to actually imitate approximately the Zend syllables.

I can only say that if the learned world could be reached in such a manner, the result would be a very great awakening of interest, it being conceded that the Gāthas possess some interest.² For it is the mere literal force of the terminology in which the *sublimity* of the delineation inheres. And no differences in opinion can affect this; the clash of views comes in chiefly, or only, on the questions over the detail of the ideas reported and as to the points of the syntax.

How is it possible that such a mass of terms as the 'holy law,' the 'Good Mind' (of God, also embodied in His people), 'His

¹ I should say that this will be retarded by the illness of the typesetter in Germany, as will also the first section of my 'Dictionary of the Gāthic Language of the Zend-Avesta,' announced some time ago. The manuscript of this lies ready and a good part of it is in the printer's hands, one-eighth of the whole book being in type.

² And it is to be hoped that their value may become popularly recognised, for a serious writer in the *Critical Review* of Jan. 1896, could say of them: "The Gāthas, or Hymns of Zoroaster are by far the most precious relic we possess of Oriental religion, the only sacred literature, which in dignity, in profoundness, in purity of thought and absolute freedom from unworthy conceptions of the Divine could ever for a moment be compared with the Hebrew scriptures."

Sovereign Power, Devotion, Healthful Weal and deathless Long-life' (here and hereafter, these latter as rewards) could recur at every turn without producing a profound effect, especially when pointed with such intervening expressions as "gifts for the two lives give us, the bodily life and the mental," "O holiness (Asha), when shall I see thee?"; "May the just Law be life-strong and clothed with body (incarnate in the tribes)," and the like; and these reappear continually in a fairly unbroken string.

But then, again, there are some who deplore a too-educated public and the danger of *zu viel concurrenz*.

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, Feb. 1899.

L. H. MILLS.

VI.—AN IRISH-LATIN CHARM.

A very interesting specimen of Irish Latinity is the 8th-century Aid-hymn or, as it might be styled, the charm for headache, preserved in the Reichenau MS No. 221 (at Karlsruhe) and first printed by Mone, *Hymni Medii Aevi*, III 181-2. A reprint of Mone's text and emendations is contained in Stokes' 'Lives of Saints' in the Book of Lismore, p. 324. But neither Mone nor Stokes has removed the apparent difficulties of the piece. The following is the text as represented by Mone:

- O rex, o rector regminis,
 O cultor coeli carminis,
 O persecutor murmoris,
 O deus alti agminis!
- 5 Aido sanctus mec prich benibula,
 Posco puro precamina,
 Ut refrigerat flumina
 Mei capitis calida,
 Curat caput cum renibus
- 10 Meis atque cum talibus,
 Cum oculis et genibus,
 Cum auribus et naribus,
 Cum inclitis euntibus,
 Cum fistulis sonantibus,
- 15 Cum lingua atque dentibus
 Cum lacrimarum fontibus,
 Sanctus Aid altus adiuuat,
 Meum caput ut liberat,
 Ut hoc totum perseuerat,
 Sanum atque uigilat.

Mone-Stokes have seen that *sanctus* in l. 5 is gloss to *Aido*, and they read the whole line thus: *Aido maic Bric beneuola*. In the next line Mone thinks that *precamina* stands equivalent to *precamine*, is in fact a spelling expressive of actual pronunciation of *precamine*; *puro* is according to him = *a puro* and refers to *Aido*. Stokes would rather change *puro* to *pura*, evidently referring it to *precamina* and making *pura precamina* dependent on *posco*. But what, then, about *benibula*? That, too, would of course have to be referred to *precamina* and so would make no sense at all. Moreover, the first four lines would then contain a mere warning to the deity that the supplicant is asking something

of St. Aid. But the proper thing, of course, is that they be a prayer to God to be favorable to St. Aid's intercession in behalf of the suppliant. The sense, then, requires that *benibula* be a verb-form on which to make dependent the dative *Aido*. I suggest that the final *a* of *benibula* as well as of *precamina* developed under the influence of *flumina* and *calida* from original *ae = e*. I would then restore the reading of ll. 5-8 in the following way:

*Aido maic Bric benevole,
Posco puro precamine,
Ut refrigeret flumina
Mei capitis calida,*

i. e. 'To Aid, the Son of Bric, grant—I pray thee with pure prayer—that he may succeed in relieving my headache.' As to *benevole*, it is true that no such imperative is on record. But Irish writers in Latin are noted for their daring grammar, and they surely might have inferred an imperative *benevole* from the participle *benevolens*.

Very strange is the *renibus* in l. 9 and *talibus* in l. 10. Neither Mone nor Stokes has found fault with *renibus*. They evidently thought it all right that the suppliant should name the kidneys in conjunction with the head to be cured. *Talibus*, they say, stands for *talis*.¹ So, with a sudden jump, the suppliant passes from the kidneys down to the ankles. Then, in line 11, he makes another jump that brings him up to the eyes and cheeks, ears and nose. But down he jumps again in line 13, where, according to Mone-Stokes, *inclitis euntibus* stands for *anculis* (= ἀγκύλαις) *euntibus*. With the last jump upwards he reaches (l. 15) the tongue and teeth, etc. Why the suppliant in such a jerky fashion should name the parts of his body which he wishes to be taken care of, Mone-Stokes fail to explain, nor do they make it clear why parts of the body should be named that have no business to be named in a prayer that, according to them, is meant to be a cure for headache. The whole question hinges on *renibus*, l. 9; *talibus*, l. 10; *inclitis euntibus*, l. 13; and *fistulis*, l. 14. Do these words really refer to parts of the body that have nothing to do with the head? *Renibus* certainly seems to do so. But the word has, I believe, lost its initial *c* and so stands for *crenibus* = *crinibus*. As to *talibus*, I think that has to be connected with its preceding *cum*. *Cumtalibus* may be cor-

¹Stokes suggests connection with the *talias* of the Lorica; it would then have to mean 'loins.'

ruption of *cuncalibus*, which developed from *cancalibus*, misread for *caucalibus*.

The same hand that wrote the text of the charm has put the gloss *cerebre* (read *cerebro*) above *talibus*. Mone-Stokes call that nonsense, but it is all right enough if *caucalibus* was the original reading. C. G. L. II 346, 53 we find *καυκο* (*e* : *καῦκα*) explained by *patena* (which may be = *patena* = *patina* 'pan'). Now, *caucale*¹ would mean 'anything relating to cup (pan),' 'that which is in the cup or pan,' and *caucalia* could easily be applied to the brains, considering that not seldom the word for cup (pan) serves at the same time to designate head; cp. German *Kopf* (= Engl. *cup*), Prov. *cobs* 'skull'; Lat. *testa* 'earthen vessel' = Fr. *tête* 'head'; cp. also MHG. *hirnecopf* 'brain-cup' = ME. *herne-pon* 'brain-pan' (Destruction of Troy 8775), *harnpane* (Pricke of Conscience 5296). Greek *ἐγ-καρος* 'what is in the head' = brains; also Latin *cerebrum* might be compared, if that has developed from *ceres-rum* and so is co-radicate with Gr. *κάρηνον* 'head' (from *κάρασ-νον*). Just so German *Hirn*² = dial. Engl. *harn* (from OTeut. **hersn-*) are co-radicate with Skr. *ḡrshn-* 'head'; they presuppose, then, the very same idea that would be represented by *caucalia* = *cerebrum*.³ If I mistake not, reference is had to this *caucalia* by the *caucale* we find in the Harl. MS No. 3376 of the Brit. Mus. (WW. 202, 1) explained by two mysterious words: *ease uel naester*. Now, may not these represent former *eāsē uel uaescen* = *eansen uel uaescen* = *earsen uel baergen* = (*h*)*aersne uel braegen*? This same (*h*)*aersne* is perhaps also hidden in the *exe* which appears by the side of *braegen* to explain *cerebrum* in the same Harl. MS (WW. 202, 33). The mistake *exe* developed from *ecse*, metathesis of *esce*, which, by way of *sc* being put for simple *s*, resulted from *ese* = *āesē* = (*h*)*aensen* = *haersne*. In a similar way *bux* (= *bax* = *pax*) *borg*, WW. 358, 33, became in the Corpus Glossary (WW. 10, 1) *bux* (= *bax*, *pax*) *box*, passing through the stages *borc*, *bosc*, *bocs*.

To return to our charm for headache. We have disposed of two words that seemed to designate parts of the body not belonging to the head. There are left *inclitis*, which Mone-Stokes consider to be a mistake for *ancylis*, and *fistulis*, which they apparently take in the sense of *tibiis*. Above *inclitis*,

¹ Cp. *caucalia cuppas* (Addit. MS 32,246 Brit. Mus.; Anglia, VIII 448).

² See Kluge's and Murray's dictionaries.

³ Cp. also German *er hat Kopf* = he has brains.

according to Mone, the scribe has written *neruibus*. I believe this was to refer also to the following *euntibus*, which I suggest stands for *ēantibus* = *emantibus* = (*h*)*imantibus*. *Incliti himantes* the nerves are called because of their importance. Who ever has had neuralgic headache will appreciate this appellation. As to *fistulis sonantibus*, they are undoubtedly the 'sounding (sound-conducting) tubes'—what is called in medical parlance the 'auditory canals.' The Anglo-Saxon glossator of the Harl. MS calls them 'ear-holes': WW. 238, 29 *fistulas i. arterias earpyrel*; *fistulas* may by *i-a* interchange have developed from *fistulis* and the gloss actually refer to our charm.

A last word in regard to the finale of the charm: *altus*, I think, ought to be capitalized, as the sense requires that it be referred to God, the 'Lord on high,' and *adiuuat*, the predicate of *Altus*, is misreading for *adiuuat* = *adiuuet*, as *liberat*, *perseuerat*, *uigilat* is for *liberaet*, *perseueraet*, *uigilaet*. In this way not only good sense is made, but also the symmetry of the hymn is restored: the supplicant finishes just as he has opened, with a prayer to God to lend his help to St. Aid, that he may work a successful cure.

To review, this is the way I would read and explain the whole charm:

O rex, o rector regminis,¹
O cultor coeli carminis,
O persecutor murmoris,
O deus alti agminis,
Aido, maic Bric, benibulae,
—Posco puro precaminae—
Ut refrigeraet flumina
Mei capitis calida,
Curaet caput cum crenibus
Meis atque caucalibus,
Cum oculis et genibus,
Cum auribus et naribus,
Cum inclitis emantibus,
Cum fistulis sonantibus,
Cum lingua atque dentibus,
Cum lacrimarum fontibus.
Sanctus Aid, Altus adiuuaet,
Meum caput ut liberaet,
Ut hoc totum perseueraet
Sanum atque uigilaet.

O King, O ruler of the world,¹
O thou rewarder of pious prayer,
O thou punisher of scoffing,
O God of the heavenly hosts,
Grant to Aid, the Son of Bric,
—I beseech thee with pious prayer—
That he may soothe the throbbing,
The violent one of my head,
That he cure the head with the hair on it
And the brains inside,
With the eyes and cheeks,
With the ears and nose,
With the famous nerve-strings,
With the sound-conducting tubes,
With the tongue and teeth,
With the lachrymal glands.
I pray that the Lord on high help St. Aid
That he may free from pain my head,
That it ever may be wholly
Sound and hale.

HARTFORD, CONN.

OTTO B. SCHLUTTER.

¹ *Regminis* may be right, but I should prefer *generis*.

NOTE.

IBIS 541, 2.

Inque tuis opifex uati quod fecit Achæo
Noxia luminibus spicula figat apis.

The Scholiast on Apoll. R. II 471, à *propos* of Paraebius, who had been doomed to misfortune in consequence of his father cutting down an oak which its coeval Hamadryad had in vain besought him to spare, mentions another Hamadryad story, which, with some modification, might perhaps form the basis of Ovid's distich. It is quoted from Charon of Lampsacus, a writer of the 5th century B. C. One Rhoecus ('Ροῖκος), whose country and parentage are not stated, seeing an oak ready to fall, ordered his sons to prop it at its lower extremity. The Hamadryad who was thus saved from perishing with her coeval tree, grateful for her preservation, appeared to Rhoecus and promised to give him anything he asked. He begged permission to cohabit with her. She consents, on condition that no other female shared his embraces, and promised to send a bee as her messenger. Once, when he was playing at the game of *παισσοί*, the bee flew up to him suddenly and forced from him an angry exclamation. The wood-nymph took offence and blinded him.

This story is repeated with trifling changes by the Etym. M. 78. 32. It is also found in the scholia on Theocritus, III 73. Rhoecus is there called a Cnidian, and the *locale* of the legend fixed at Ninos in Assyria. The time of the lovers' meeting is announced by a bee; but here the narrative ends, as if the legend were well known and the remaining part of it did not require to be told.

Tzetzes, on Lycophr. Alexandr. 480, transfers the legend to Arcas, son of Callisto, the first king of Arcadia. Arcas, while hunting, finds the Hamadryad Chrysopeleia on the point of destruction by a winter torrent which had sapped her oak: he turned the course of the stream and saved the Nymph with her

tree. By her he became the father of Elatus and Amphidamas. There is no mention of the bee, nor of the blinding by which the Nymph punished her lover's ill-treatment of the insect messenger.

Pausanias, VIII 4. 1, speaking of this same Arcas, whom he represents as introducing civilized habits, such as bread-making and weaving, into Arcadia, says he did not marry a mortal, but cohabited with a Dryad, by whom he became the father of Azan, Apheidas, and Elatus. The story of the Hamadryad, the bee, and the blinding is not alluded to.

It seems probable that the legend, so far as it concerns the saving of the Hamadryad with her tree, was separable from what looks like an accretion, the story of the bee-messenger and the blinding of the mortal lover. This latter portion does not appear to form part of the ordinary accounts of Arcas. What is more, there is some discrepancy in the form which this accretion assumes. The name, Rhoecus, is common to the three narrators, but only one of them (the Scholiast on Theocritus) calls him a *Cnidian*. Two of the narratives say he was blinded by the Nymph; but of this there is no mention in the Schol. on Theocritus. There was, no doubt, considerable variation in the details of the legend; but for the Theocritean Scholiast, we should never have heard of its connexion with so remote a locality as Assyria.

It seems then no very far-fetched hypothesis that in other versions other details, varying perhaps with the alleged nationality of the hero, existed; e. g. I should not doubt that the bee's body was often represented as injured, and that it was the visible maltreatment of its limbs or wings which roused the indignation of its mistress. Landor, indeed, in his *Hellenics*, so represents it:

The poor bee
Return'd, (but not until the moon shone bright,)
And found the Hamadryad with her head
Upon her aching wrist, and showed one wing
Half-broken off, the other's meshes marr'd,
And there were bruises which no eye could see
Saving a Hamadryad's.

And so Lowell ap. Gayley, *Classic Myths*, p. 211.

It would only be a further step to make the punishment come from the very object injured: the Nymph who on some accounts blinded Rhoecus, would on others wreak the same punishment by sending bees to sting him in the eyes.

It will be objected that none of the accounts describes Rhoecus as a *uates Achaeus*. The answer is easy: the Latin words are vague and indeterminate; *uates* might mean a poet or a seer indifferently: *Achaeus* might be merely Greek or a native of Achaia or (conceivably) Thessalian. We need not be particular in pressing all the details of a story which obviously assumes different shapes in different parts of the Hellenic world.

It had also occurred to me as possible that the poet of the *Ibis* alluded to *Daphnis*. The story of Daphnis is in several points identical with the story of Rhoecus. He too was loved by a Nymph, was admitted to her intimacy on condition of loving no other woman, and was punished for betraying the Nymph, with blindness. (See the passages from Diod. IV 84; Parthen. 29; Aelian, Var. Hist. X 18; Serv. on Ecl. V 20, cited by Reitzenstein, Epigramm und Skolion, pp. 197-200.) But in the Daphnis legends there is, so far as I know, no hint of a bee being employed as the go-between of the lovers, nor of the injury committed on the bee which caused the Nymph's anger and its tragic consummation. Whereas the whole point of the *Ibis* distich lies in this very particular: the Achaean bard or seer is stung in the eyes by a bee, and, as if to accentuate the fact, by a *working-bee*. Again, though it is not inconceivable that by a Roman poet Daphnis should have been called *uates Achaeus*, the former as a singer and the founder of bucolic poetry, the latter as a Greek, it would be more in accordance with the usual method which the *Ibis* follows, to call him a *Sicilian*.

On these grounds I reject the view that Daphnis is the person meant in the *Ibis* distich.

It seems worth while to call attention to a fact, which the publication of Mr. Kenyon's edition of Bacchylides brings into prominence, in reference to the value of the *Ibis* scholia. The legend mentioned in Bacchyl., fr. 1 (p. 105 Kenyon), of the rape committed by Minos on Dexithea, and the consequent birth of Euxantius, is distinctly given by these scholia, and, so far as I know, nowhere else. Schneider, therefore, was perfectly justified in citing this scholion in his *Nicandrea* as an authentic tradition coming from an unsuspected source. See Classical Review for Jan.-Feb. 1898, p. 66.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Die antike Kunstprosa, vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance, von EDUARD NORDEN. Leipzig (Teubner), 1898. 2 vols. Pp. xviii + 969.

It is the habit of those who look upon classical studies in America as having fallen hopelessly into detailed and fruitless minutiae, to deprecate the large and almost exclusive influence upon them of German scholarship. But would that these critics might be brought to acquaint themselves with the best and largest products of contemporary German scholarship and henceforth voice rather the wish that American classical philology might emulate the more that broad-horized and truly magnificent historical and literary philology, of which Germany has not lacked distinguished representatives from the days of its illustrious founders, the pupils of Fr. Aug. Wolf. In the development of every phase of the study of antiquity the University of Bonn has played a conspicuous rôle, and from the school of Welcker, Ritschl, and Jahn have come forth the masters who are still training us of the younger generation. The tradition in Bonn is a pervasive and vital one, as all have felt who have come into closer contact with teachers and pupils there, and out of it has proceeded this work by one of the younger members of the 'Bonn school,' to which, in the person of Professor Bücheler, it is dedicated.

Professor Norden entitles his work *Die antike Kunstprosa*, not professing to present a history of ancient prose, but using the term *Kunstprosa* in a somewhat sharply restricted sense of the prose which in one way or another looks beyond the mere communication of thought and aims to produce a calculated rhetorical effect upon the reader. It is the element of consciousness or calculation that would seem to be the distinguishing characteristic of *Kunstprosa*, so that, for example, an artificial simplicity or an affected naturalness (as in some phases of Atticism) would be ground for classifying a given work as *Kunstprosa* quite as much as the presence of every form of rhetorical artifice.

In the introduction Norden discusses some fundamental matters which conditioned the development of a rhetorical prose, and passes over in the first chapter to the features of prose style which passed in antiquity for the invention of Gorgias, the so-called Gorgianic figures. In regard to the first and most important of these, *antithesis*, it is to be interpreted as the conscious application to speech of the great antinomies of thought which the

philosophers of the VIth and Vth centuries B.C. were the first among occidental peoples to grasp and to formulate. When put in this large connection, as is well observed, we are able to look with more indulgence on those features of the style of Gorgias which seem to us so puerile. But though Gorgias was given credit for the invention of these figures, yet the pages of Herodotus and Euripides show that before him they had made their entrance into literature. In regard to these rhetorical figures as well as the use of poetical diction in prose, the term 'invention' can only mean for us that Gorgias brought to conscious application elements already in use. In addition to these 'inventions' of Gorgias still another element went to the production of rhetorical prose, the rhythmical period. The origin of this antiquity attributed to Thrasymachus of Chalcedon, who, like Gorgias in respect to the other elements named, may pass as the one who first reduced to rule a feeling common to all the Greek peoples and already employed by Sophron in the rhythmic prose of the mime.

The three elements thus considered—figures of speech, poetical color, the rhythmical period—became from this time essential postulates of artistic prose style, and the illustrations of the theory which Norden's comprehensive reading has here brought together, are of exceptional interest (p. 50 ff.). Language thus put together was akin to music, and it followed therefore that the voice must be employed in a manner intermediate between the tone of speech and song, accompanied by an harmonious and suitable movement of the body. The application of these principles as seen in the style of Gorgias is the subject of ch. III (p. 65), in which the rhythmic *κῶλα* of Gorgias are examined and the means by which they were produced. The conceits and paradoxes of thought, the natural concomitants of a style that aimed at effects so bizarre and unnatural, are also examined in this connection. The excesses of the master were surpassed by the pupils, and in them (Hippias, Alcidamas, Agathon) we can still from the meagre fragments discern that the distinction between prose and poetry was almost obliterated (cf. the parody of Agathon in *Sympos.* 194 E ff.). On the other hand, poetry learned the arts of the new rhetoric, and features of it which are discernible in Euripides reach their climax in the bombast of Agathon. The decline of tragedy was accelerated by the sophistical rhetoric, and with the encroachment of poetical language and rhythms upon the domain of prose, poetry by degrees gave way to it; history took the place of the epos, the prose *parainesis* of gnomic poetry, the poetical encomium yielded to the prose *laudatio*, the *θρήνος* to the *λόγος ἐπιτάφιος*.

The chapter following (p. 79) is devoted to a very interesting consideration of the theory of ancient historiography and its relation to rhetoric and to poetry, after which the masters of classical Attic prose are reviewed briefly, so far as they fall within the territory of *Kunstprosa*. Thucydides, whose style betrays a

curious struggle between individualism and the teachings of the new rhetoric; Xenophon, whose *naïveté* is in no small degree an artificial and calculated product, and Plato. Norden's discussion of Plato reveals more accurately than the foregoing the point of view from which he has undertaken to delineate the history of ancient prose style. For, while no one will doubt that Plato is one of the greatest masters of artistic prose, Norden's discussion is practically limited to the attitude of Plato toward certain of the refinements of the sophistical rhetoric. His treatment thus touches but a small part of what should constitute a study of the style of Plato, if indeed it does not leave untouched the real style of the man altogether. For about the person of Plato must be grouped many fundamental questions of stylistic history of much greater importance than his attitude toward the Gorgianic figures and poetical diction. In regard to Isocrates Norden presents in summary the characteristics of his style, emphasizing the fact that while he brought to perfection the artifices of Gorgias, he deprived them of their puerile excesses. His original contribution to style consisted in substituting for the short and verse-like *κῶλα* of his master, a full and rich prose rhythm and the periodic sentence. The remaining Attic orators are passed over with the briefest mention of Lysias and Demosthenes.

The period which follows is one of scanty record, but of extreme importance for the history of style, for it is the period of divergence between the extreme tendencies of Gorgias and Isocrates, and the reaction known as Atticism. It was, furthermore, the style of this period on which Roman prose was formed, and it also furnishes the key to the prose of the Greek Renaissance in the first and second centuries A. D. It is from this point on that the more original features of Norden's work appear, in tracing and distinguishing the outlines of stylistic history. Chapter five (p. 126) begins with a brief consideration of Demetrius of Phaleron: *hic primus inflexit orationem et eam mollem teneramque reddidit* (Brut. 36). But Demetrius was still an Attic orator and could not completely deprive Attic eloquence of its charm and dignity. The ornate and artificial style of Demetrius *e sophistarum fontibus defluxit in forum* (Brut. 96). But the beginning made by Demetrius culminated not on Attic soil, but in Asia. Of the two types of Asiatic eloquence distinguished by Cicero, that represented by Hegesias is best understood and stands in most intimate relationship with the sophistical rhetoric of the Vth century. The long periodic sentence of Isocrates and Demosthenes Hegesias broke up into short rhythmic *κῶλα*, in which, to produce the desired effect, he made free use of words superfluous to the thought (*quasi complementa numerorum*) and was quite regardless of normal word-order (cf. p. 136). In other respects too he reproduces the mannerisms of the early sophists and may be looked upon as their legitimate descendant. Of the second Asiatic style, characterized *non flumine solum orationis sed etiam exor-*

nato et facto genere verborum, and of which until lately no Greek monument has been known to exist, Norden recognizes a conspicuous example in the long and very perfect inscription of Antiochus of Commagene from the 1st century B. C. (published in 1890 by Hermann and Puchstein). In the history of style its importance is felt to be so great that it is reproduced entire, and in fact as a connecting link between the Attic prose of the IVth century and the Asianism which confronts us in early Latin prose, and in a modified form in Cicero, it is of great value.

As the culminating point of rhetorical artifice in the use of language it affords appropriate transition to the history of the reaction known as Atticism. This movement, called into life by the excesses of the Asiatic rhetoric in oratory and history, would seem to have begun about 200 B. C. It took its rise, we may believe, from the centers of the scholarly study of the past, Alexandria and Pergamon, where the study of the Attic orators led most naturally to an imitation of them. The question which has been discussed so actively of late years, whether the Atticistic reaction is to be looked upon as a Pergamene or an Alexandrine movement, Norden dismisses as a question incapable of solution with our present material, and as unessential to the further history of the movement. By the middle of the 1st century B. C. Atticism had in theory at least conquered, but Asianism was by no means driven from the field, although its representatives did not frankly profess their position and defend it, but claimed for themselves the true spirit of Attic style quite as vigorously as their opponents. In general the 'new style' with all its extravagances, as being an historical development, and as adapting itself to the tastes and tendencies of its public, possessed a sounder historical justification than the reactionary and artificial *μίμησις τῶν ἀρχαίων* of the Atticists. To trace this antithesis of the new and the old style through the subsequent history of ancient literature is the task which Norden pursues in the remainder of his work.

The period of Roman literature which antedates the introduction of Greek rhetorical studies lies in reality outside of the territory which Norden investigates. Cato here marks the transition, and in the fragments of his orations there is discernible a certain vacillation between the rough and inartistic language such as contemporary inscriptions reveal, and attempts at producing rhetorical effects such as Greek rhetoricians were then beginning to teach their Roman pupils (cf. p. 166). After Cato the development is more rapid, and is to be seen in the fragments of the younger contemporaries of Cato, and then most conspicuously in C. Gracchus. His master was an Asiatic rhetorician, whose theory of oratory was entirely congenial to the intense natural endowment of Gracchus. The fragments of his speeches reveal numerous examples of the extreme mannerisms of Asianism—carefully balanced *κόμματα*, antitheses, *ὁμοιοτέλευτα*, and rhythmic clausules. Evidence of the same rhetorical school is found in contemporaries

and successors of Gracchus, and notably in the puerile *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. In historical composition Caelius Antipater is the first conspicuous example of the new rhetoric, who for the sake of artificial rhythmic effects was notorious for complete disregard of natural word-order (cf. ad *Herennium* [ed. F. Marx], IV 18).

The classicism of the Ciceronian period (p. 181 ff.) is the result of the application of principles which have their origin in Greek theory. Careful selection of words (*elegantia*), rejection not only of all foreign words but also of older and harsher Latin forms (*urbanitas*), produced a finish of style that has perhaps never been equalled in the history of any other language. But it impoverished Latin unduly¹ and deprived it of many expressions of native picturesqueness and force. The grammatical controversy too of analogy and anomaly, in which the leading literary forces of Rome stood on the side of analogy from the middle of the II^d century, contributed to this impoverishment by the limitations placed upon the coinage of new words. In syntax, while the older freedom of construction was reduced to fixed norms, the same exclusiveness was not observed and the influence of Greek was admitted with much freedom, culminating for prose in Sallust and for poetry in Horace. Norden then passes in review (p. 194 ff.) the most important writers of the period: Varro, Sallust, and Nepos, as imperfect representatives of classicism; Caesar, Cicero, and Livy, as its norm and standard. The characterizations are brief, and in general admirable. The fullest treatment is naturally given to Cicero, whose admirers will be glad to find in these pages points of view for the consideration of his style, which have important bearing on the general estimate of his character. Norden's conception of the preliminary studies necessary to a just estimate of Cicero, as outlined on p. 214 ff., would seem perhaps a little discouraging after the centuries of devoted study which have been bestowed upon him. But I presume he is right, and his ideal is not a mere scientific registration of facts, but the recovery of points of view which shall assist us to understand and to feel Cicero as he was understood and felt by his contemporaries, and in a less degree by the Italian humanists: "for I confess," he says, "that I began to know Cicero best, from the time when I approached him through the mediation of the humanists."

The second main division of the first book begins with a general introduction on the new political and social environment of literature in the Roman Empire. Almost the only advance in literary art that can be discerned is the growth of individualism, with corresponding advance in the art of characterization and psychological analysis. The treatment of this relatively trite subject is made vivid by rich illustration and many original observations in detail. The two stylistic tendencies already observed

¹ Cf. Professor Shorey's Introduction to the Odes of Horace. Boston, 1898.

become still more pronounced in the imperial period, in Greek as well as in Latin—classicism, which was archaistic in tendency, and the new or modern style. The extreme representatives of the latter school display the rhetorical artifices of the early sophists, and of the Asianism derived from them. The more moderate ones avoid its extremes, but admit its claims in theory. The position of the saner representatives of the reactionary school of classicism is given by Quintilian (II 5, 21), in the injunction that one must not be *antiquitatis nimius admirator*, nor on the other hand *recentis huius lasciviae flosculis captus*. As between the two extremes the intrinsic justification of the modern school was greater than that of the Atticistic reaction, as corresponding more accurately to the character and the requirements of the time. Between the two extremes most men of sense took their stand, as Cicero had done in his day. Quintilian, while in sympathy and spirit a reactionary and a bitter enemy of the mannerisms of the new rhetoric, was still not blind to the excesses of his own partisans, as we have seen. In practice the extremes of Asianism are found in the treatment of declamatory themes which the elder Seneca has preserved for us in such tedious fullness. In form these declaimers affected an intensity of style in inverse proportion to the significance of their efforts. Brevity, point, elevation, finish and charm are the results at which they aim, but with a *κακοζήλεια* which plunges them into all the corresponding defects. The careful characterization of this style, given on p. 263 ff., is one of the most valuable chapters of the book. The qualities which these rhetorical products display are the same as Cicero found to censure in the Asianism of his day. We therefore reach the result (p. 299) that in the historical development of ancient rhetorical prose, a continuous tradition may be discerned from the Vth century B. C. to the Ist and IId centuries A. D. The relation of the two stylistic theories to practice is then considered in a review of the principal authors of the silver Latinity. To select only the more important characterizations, the younger Seneca is the greatest and most typical representative of the new rhetoric. He was averse to imitation of the ancients and judged Cicero harshly; his nature was theatrical, and found a natural expression in the pointed and theatrical style of the declaimers. But his use of rhetoric is bold and conceived in large effects, and was a form of expression suited to an age of extravagant tendencies in good and bad—*ingenium amoenum et temporis eius auribus accommodatum*. In regard to Tacitus Norden is quite full, and what he presents is likely to meet with no little protest. The current conception of the genetic development of the style of Tacitus from the *Dialogus* to the *Annals* is rejected, and, with Leo, Norden believes that the *Agricola*, *Germania*, and *Dialogus* fall at nearly the same time and represent stylistic *tours de force* in different *genera dicendi*. His style at its culmination is a more highly developed form of the Sallustian *brevitas*, not with-

out large influence of the rhetorical and declamatory schools of his time (p. 342).

In the period which follows the archaistic tendency gains for a time the ascendancy, and, apart from the domain of stylistic theory, there emerges at this time a clearly defined romantic feeling of devotion to the past in all of its phases. It was a time of almost conscious recognition that the age of production was over and that it was time to gather up the heritage of the past for transmission to the future. But in the domain of literature the strife between the old and the new—between the style of conscious imitation of classical models, and the rhetoric of new inventions and new artifices for stimulating the jaded literary sense—continues. The difficulty of distinguishing between the two tendencies increases, however, for on the one hand the Asianism of the period sought for new effects in archaic words, while on the other some of the better representatives of Atticism (e. g. Arrian) reveal their theory less in painful reproduction of the vocabulary of the Attic masters than in the general *ῥησος* of their style. The interesting historical explanation of Roman archaism, which Wölfflin presented in his study of the Latinity of Minucius Felix, as the returning influence of the language of the provinces, and especially of Africa, where Plautus and Cato had remained the dominant authors, Norden (though he does not allude to it) would reject in favor of a conscious and learned archaistic movement, entirely analogous to the prevailing Atticism of contemporary Greek writers. Fronto, the most typical representative of archaism at Rome, was a personal friend of the Hyperatticists of his time; in his own use of Greek he is of the same school (cf. Naber, p. 242); he is opposed to the formation of new words, and, like contemporary Greek Atticists, he excerpted early Latin authors for archaic words and stimulated his pupils to the same activity.

For the new style the theoretical evidence is derived in larger degree from the abuse of the Atticists, but direct evidence is not lacking (p. 371). As in the Asianism of the III^d century B. C. so here it is possible to show that the new school was a conscious disciple of the rhetoric of the early sophists.

In practice, Norden distinguishes among the Atticists between the stricter and the more moderate followers of the dogma of imitation. To the latter class belong Plutarch, whose style is at its best in some of the ethical essays of the *Moralia*, Lucian, Arrian, Dio Cassius. Adherents of the stricter Atticism are rather the professional rhetoricians, Aristides and others. For the *νεώτεροι* Norden contents himself with giving specimens of their rhetoric, since, as he says, a characterization of their style would be only a repetition of the Asianism already described for the III^d century B. C. and the Ist century A. D. The volume concludes with a consideration of the stylistic position of some specimens of Greek literature which might not perhaps be looked for here; so especially the preface to the Pseudo-Xenoph. *Cynegetica* and the erotic Romances.

With volume two the literature of Christianity is taken up. Passing over the valuable introduction and the chapter on the literature of the New Testament, we may turn to the literature of Christianity which begins with the Apologists of the later part of the II^d century A. D. For the early church in general the New Testament stood as a protest against the pride of form and eloquence of the profane literatures, and in theory the majority of the Christian writers derived from the simplicity of their sacred books the principle that attention should be given only to the expression of thought, and diverted from care in regard to composition. But the literature that is preserved reveals that from an early time theory and practice were kept well asunder. In the gnostic heresy the complete assimilation of Greek form took place earliest, while in the orthodox church, as early as Clemens of Alexandria, we find a style as elaborated and as highly wrought as any product of the sophistical prose of pagan rhetoricians (p. 549).

The influence of rhetoric on the Christian sermon culminates in the IVth century, when we find men like Johannes Chrysostom in the East and Augustine in the West complaining that their hearers come to them expecting much the same sort of entertainment as they would look for in the auditoriums of the declaimers. The form of the sermon developed on the lines of classical models, and on festival occasions corresponded to the panegyricus, while the ordinary sermon of instruction and exhortation was closely analogous to the Cynic diatribe (p. 556 and cf. p. 538). Of the three great preachers of the IVth century—Basil, Joh. Chrysostom, and Gregory of Nazianzus—Norden dwells longest on the last, of whom he has given a fascinating characterization (562 ff.). His style he designates in a word as a tempered Asianism and justifies this judgment in detail.

Returning to the field of later Roman literature, we find that the school of classical imitation has lost ground; for while in the ranks of the zealous protestants against Christianity (Macrobius and his circle) there was boundless devotion to the past, the stylistic tendencies of the present could not easily be escaped. The jurists, moving in a narrower tradition, are almost the only ones who succeeded in producing a style of classical purity, and of other writers Lactantius and Boethius were the only important representatives of the same effort. But for the whole period of the growing barbarism of the West, "the dogma of all stylistic barbarism was characteristic, that tattooing was essential to beauty" (Bernays).

The material for this period is arranged geographically, and accordingly Africa is taken up first. Here Norden's effort is to show first of all that there was, from a stylistic point of view, no such thing as a specific African Latinity, but that the qualities which, from the early Renaissance, have been looked upon as characteristic of a *tumor Africanus* are nothing more than a pro-

nounced manifestation of the artifices of the sophistical rhetoric. Florus and Apuleius, Minucius Felix and Tertullian are reviewed, and the characterization of the last-named author seems of exceptional interest (p. 606 ff.). From the sermon style of Cyprian and Augustine characteristic rhetorical artifices already observed, especially parallelism with *homoioteleuton*, passed over into fixed characteristics of sermon literature.

As in the earlier period of the declining empire Africa holds the leading place in literature, so for the Vth and following centuries Gaul. The natural fondness of the Gauls for the refinements of speech (*argute loqui*), which Cato had observed and noted in his Origines, found in the sophistical rhetoric a welcome ally, and perhaps nowhere, not even in Africa, did the Asiatic tendency develop into more extravagant manifestations than here. The influence of Gaul was felt in Italy and contributed to the affected style of mannerism seen in Symmachus and Ammianus Marcellinus, Jerome and Ambrosius.

Limits of space which have already been far exceeded preclude a further following of Norden's argument through the Middle Ages and into the early Renaissance, although in many respects this is the portion of his work which makes the largest claim to original treatment. But passing over the valuable section on the antique in the Middle Ages, it must suffice to say that Norden continues the history of the two lines of stylistic tendency, traced through antiquity, down to the point where the Latinity of modern times ceased to be a thing cultivated for its own sake. For the English scholar the effort to prove that Euphuism is a direct product of the Isocratean studies of the humanists will be of interest, though doubtless others, with me, will question whether the problem is so simple. The work is concluded by two appendices, one on the history of rhyme, the second on the history of the rhythmic clausule.

To pass authoritative judgment on the enormous piece of work which is presented in these two volumes must be the task of students of vastly wider reading and more intimate familiarity with the field covered than the present reviewer possesses, or ever hopes to possess.¹ In detail there is much to which exception may well be taken, as is inevitable in the treatment of a theme so dependent on subjective feeling as literary style. For myself I have felt this in numerous places, where my own studies gave me some right to an opinion. But it is our duty to look beyond the limits of our own garden-patch, and to modify frankly

¹Since this was written, aside from a number of briefer notices, a comprehensive review by W. Schmid, the learned author of *Der Atticismus*, has appeared in the Berliner Phil. Wochenschrift, No. 8 (Feb. 25), 1899. Unfortunately, he permits the effect of some excellent criticism, combined with genuine recognition of the merits of Norden's work, to be marred by a disagreeable tone of carping querulousness.

opinions or feelings, if in the light of the whole they shall require it.

It is therefore with diffidence that I would venture the opinion that the book is open to the criticism of endeavoring to formulate stylistic history within the limits of too simple a scheme. The problems are, I fear, vastly more complex than one would gather from Norden's treatment. So, for example, I question whether the personal element, which we formulate in the dictum of Buffon—*le style est l'homme même*—can be so largely eliminated as is done by Norden (p. 11). There was to be sure, as he points out, the rhetorical theory which made style dependent on subject-matter, and independent of personality, but in practice is the theory confirmed in antiquity (for its applicability to Tacitus is far from certain), unless in the case of some trifling rhetorician, such as Apuleius, to whom no style was a vital expression of character, and whose facility of change had, I suspect, much the same ethical significance as the 'style' which in certain grades of society is 'put on.' One may question, too, whether the regular recurrence of typical vices of style in all periods justifies in all cases the inference of historical connection with a given source. But that the elements to which Norden gives predominate significance are present and of wide influence no one will deny in the face of the evidence which is here arrayed, and to have drawn these lines sharply through the whole history of ancient style is an Herculean service, for which the author may be confident of the gratitude of literary students throughout the world.

Jan. 15, 1899.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

Homère. Étude historique et critique. Par VICTOR TERRET, Professeur au petit séminaire d'Autun. Paris, Albert Fontemoing, 1899.

In a recent number of the Journal (A. J. P. XIX 346) I deprecated the premature introduction of the Homeric Question into the cycle of secondary studies. It can not fail to cool the ardor of the young student so readily kindled by the dramatic interest of Iliad and Odyssey; and to show how far I should be willing to go, I cited M. Victor Terret as an ensample to the flock. The *professeur au petit séminaire d'Autun* has read a great deal about Homer. The bibliography appended to his book takes up some 114 pages and covers the ground from 1795 to 1898. Being arranged chronologically and not topically, it is of the least conceivable practical value, even if the numerous misspellings did not breed distrust. Still, it is fair to suppose that the author has dipped into a large part of the works that he has cited in the text, if not all those he has cited in the bibliography. Into this stream of learning he stepped a unitarian. Out of it he stepped a

unitarian, and to an unbelieving generation and to those who would fain believe, some slight sketch of the portly volume may be interesting. Whether M. Terret's faith will save his book alive is another matter.

Homer, it seems, was born in Asia Minor and belongs to the Ionian race. The old contest as to his birthplace is settled in favor of Smyrna. The Greek epopee was composed at Chios. Homer is an historical personage, but the details of his life are unknown. There is every presumption that the text of his poems has been preserved intact by oral tradition—that is, substantially intact—for Aristarchus took the various editions in hand, and his *diorthosis* served as the basis of what is our *vulgata*. A great man was Aristarchus, but he suffered a sad eclipse of faith, if indeed it is true that he regarded the last book of the Odyssey as a spurious additament. Such a concession is as when one letteth out water. We all know the perils that environ the man who excises the last verses of St. Mark and obelizes the verse of the Three Witnesses. Crates of Mallos was a fanciful soul, but he was strong in the faith. He believed in the one Homer. Even the devils like Zoilus believed, although, unlike the orthodox devils, they did not tremble. Then there arose in the bosom of the Church the Separatists, who ascribed the Iliad and the Odyssey to different authors, in the same heretical spirit as that which divides the body of Isaiah. They had, however, no certain hold, and Seneca scouts their quibbles as Rabelais mocks at the futile controversies of the scholastics. Moderns have taken up the same line and pointed out the differences between the two poems in religion, morals and politics, the differences in art. There are differences but there are no dissidences. There is no great gulf fixed. The poems differ as the spheres differ, but the characters abide. The Ulysses of the Iliad is the Ulysses of the Odyssey, and the Helen of the one is the Helen of the other. There is no reason to believe in the superior civilization of the Odyssey. There is no East, no West. The civilization of both poems rests on the gold basis. In any case, what changes may not half a century produce in culture in composition? And the Iliad belongs to the morning, the Odyssey to the evening of Homer's life. Witness the difference between Hamlet and The Tempest, as set forth by M. Guizot. Then the diction is the same, the style is the same in the two poems. To be sure, when one is so poor a proof-reader of Greek as M. Victor Terret, one becomes happily inaccessible to the small discrepancies that agitate other scholars.

The fact is that the faith in the personality of Homer was undisturbed down to the close of the seventeenth century. Why, Fénelon proved the existence of God by the existence of Homer. Then the skeptics arose. While France was engaged in all manner of frivolities the Germans were working at Greek, and then came a renaissance of Greek studies. But the renaissance of Greek studies is as dangerous as the renaissance of Biblical

studies. The Elohist and the Jahvist take shape in the same century that gives birth to that Demogorgon, Wolf. Wolf was an unsanctified soul like his forerunner, Astruc. His incisive language, his violent temper and his literary vanity plunged him into difficulties with the leading scholars of Germany. He sought distraction in travel, and was about to betake himself to Italy when he died, at Marseilles, Aug. 8, 1824, at the age of sixty-five years. "By an odd irony of fate he still rests in the ancient city of the Phocaeans, where the cult of Homer was always held in honor." An odd irony of fate? Why not, M. Terret, a judgment of God?

Still, humanly speaking, the *Prolegomena* is a fine work of erudition, composed with the rigorous method that belongs to a scientific treatise. But compliments like this are always a flourish preliminary to fatal transfixion. Wolf's book staggered Goethe, but Goethe recovered his balance. Schiller never lost his, and it was well; for the rigorous scientific method has proved a failure. Wolf's notions as to the limitations of early poetic art are mere affirmations. His arguments for the late age of writing have been disposed of by Hissarlik and Cyprus. The bulk of the *Iliad* could not have interfered with the recital of it at festivals. Add up the verses of the dramatic pieces performed at the Dionysia and the sum amounts to more than the sixteen thousand verses of the *Iliad*. Exit Wolf.

The poetry of Homer differs so much from other Indo-European epopees that the unity of the Greek epic stands out in triumphant contrast. The critical dissection of the poems and the long array of inconsistencies amount to nothing. Modern literature abounds in errors that are just as flagrant, if not more so. Shakespeare and Schiller would fall into the same condemnation as Homer. French authors seem to have escaped. The language of Homer gives no hold to the notion of the diverse origin of the different books. It is useless to go into the matter, if one could. Differences have been pointed out, but they are not vital. The epic dialect is a literary idiom which had ripened by the tenth century and was ready for the hand of the great artist who supervened. This is M. Georges Perrot's judgment. Fick's theory of the Ionization of Aeolic songs, rejected by Maurice Croiset and Georges Perrot, has been finally disposed of by Zuretti. Helbig and Rayet, by the study of contemporary art, have vindicated Homer's truthfulness to his own time. *Summa summarum*. One does not hesitate to conclude, with Charles Thurot, that the dissection of the poems of Homer is the fundamental sin of modern philology.

This conclusion having been reached, the book might have stopped at the 128th page. But your true exorciser resorts to all his means, bell, book and candle, to lay the evil spirit, and there is yet to come an analysis of the *Iliad* with a refutation of all objections to the unity, and the like of the *Odyssey*. So many

eminent literary men are unitarians, so many eminent scholars assume the attitude of St. Michael when contending with the devil, that the time spent with M. Terret is pleasantly beguiled. Sainte-Beuve's practised hand sketches an outline of the Iliad. Lamartine, 'the French Homer,' utters an eloquent protest against "all these incredulities, these vestiges of the antique envy which has pursued the grand old man down to posterity"—an envy from which the French Homer doubtless felt that he himself was not free. But delightful as the book is, the limitations of the Journal in space and in character, both of which have already been violated in this notice, forbid me to follow M. Terret in his refutation of Lachmann and Grote, of Steinthal, Koechly, Kirchhoff, Wilamowitz and Seeck. Like Bossuet in his *Variations des églises protestantes*, M. Terret makes effective use of the divergencies of those who dissent from the faith in the oneness of Homer and the oneness of his poems, and there is something pastoral in his paternal insistence on belief in these fundamental articles. It will not do to find in the Odyssey a certain beauty, a certain dramatic force. Unity of action is the vital beauty of every poetical work. What saith St. Augustin? "*Epist. XVIII, ad Coelest, numerus 2*": *Omnis porro pulchritudinis forma unitas*.

Upon the long analysis of Iliad and Odyssey there follows a chapter on the poetical art of the two poems. In the appended bibliographical part an account is given of the MSS and editions of Homer, together with a long list of books pertaining to Homer. This bibliography has already been characterized. A number of illustrations, more or less capricious, add interest to the volume of 640 pp.

The technical Greek scholar will be fretted at the misprints and other slips. The lover of Homer will be attracted by the enthusiastic student revealed in M. Terret. The Homeric specialist can hardly be expected to find much satisfaction in a book like this. Discontent is the vital breath of the specialist, and I foresee that there are those who will quarrel with me for robbing phonetics in order to pay a tribute to mere literature. But the big book may serve as a temporary bulwark to the practical teacher, who declines to discuss with young boys the miserable patchwork of the *Κόλος μάχη* and the interpolated coquettishness of Penelope (A. J. P. VIII 422).

B. L. G.

Establishment and Extension of the Law of Thurneysen and Havet, by LIONEL HORTON-SMITH. (Reprinted from the American Journal of Philology.)

Mr. L. Horton-Smith has collected from this Journal (vols. XVI, pp. 444-67, XVII 172-96, and XVIII 43-69, in part) his

essays on the phonetics of *av/ov* and *au/ou* in Latin, and issued them with an index and "important postscript" under the title 'Establishment and Extension of the Law of Thurneysen and Havet,' etc. (Cambridge, Macmillan & Bowes). A proposition advanced by Thurneysen and Havet, and already accepted by the handbooks of Stolz, Henry and Lindsay, might be held not to demand any further establishment; but we can only be grateful for the skilful and painstaking defence here presented—*docta, Juppiter, et laboriosa*. The great exception to the law, *ovis*, is explained, like *boves*, as a loan-word, and *ovum* as a demi-semi-loan-word—for which English *egg* seems a striking parallel, though the force of this is somewhat lessened if we note that *eye* as a designation of both *egg* and *eye* would be confusing. But *ovis* may, after all, not be a loan-word and *movet vovet fovet* not come from **mevet*, etc.—An examination of the alleged cases of Gk. -οF- and Latin -av- shows that most of them are suspicious: *caulae* 'holes': *caulis* 'stalk' beside *cavus* 'hollow': *καυλός* 'stalk.' Again, *cavus*: *κῶσι* 'dens' allows the explanation from *ῶ* in a long vowel-series, with *ῶ* in *κοῖλος* reduced from *ω* (cf. Collitz, *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* 28, pp. 100 seq.).—What makes it probable that *Favonius* is "the burning wind" and not "the bright wind"? Plautus calls it *serenus* (Merc. 876) and *liquidiusculus* (Mil. 665), and we may note the signification of German *heiter* (v. Kluge and Paul, s. v.).—Specific Latin explanations are at hand for some of the words. Thus *cavo-s* is a sort of reverse of **vaco-s*, and *vacuus* we must derive from **vacovos*. Is not **covo-s* in the word **co-hum* 'hollow in a plough' the result of an infection of *cavos* from **vacovos*? The vowel-color of Spanish *cueva* meets its explanation in this way, though the Greeks or Massilians may have introduced *κόος* (Hesychius), or we might even suppose the *o* of our English *cove*—in its earlier Germanic cognates—to have had an influence, as Prof. Marden suggests to me.—The little gold weasel inscription on which our author and Lindsay, following Buecheler (cf. *supra*, vol. XVIII, 489), lay so much stress is also far from convincing: FOVE L· CORNELIAI L. F might be an amulet inscription meaning *fave Corneliae* (dat.), but I think it much more likely that Cornelia had had an image of a dead pet weasel made with the inscription *fui Corneliae* (gen.). This type of inscription is well known in Oscan (v. von Planta's texts, Nos. 137, 164a, 172, 177abc, 296), while Martial tells us of the picture of a pet dog painted in anticipation of her death (I 109), and reports the epitaph (in the 1st person) of a pet hound (XI 69). Corinna's parrot also had a 1st-person epitaph (Ovid, *Amores*, II 6, 61-2). The *e* of *fove* need cause no difficulty (v. Lindsay, *The Latin Language*, IV, §34). We might explain FOV-*e* as the unduplicated correspondent of Avestan *b(a)-vāv-a*, and -*e* might even be an active ending. The normal form *fui* preponderated in compounds. We find *fūvimus* in Ennius, and FVVEIT on an epitaph. Perhaps *fove* is for FVVEI with *ov* as a graphic

representation such as we have in *-vos* for *-vvs*. It involves us in less difficulty, however, if we explain the *-ov-* of FOVE as *-ou-*, and inscriptions of the first half of the 2d century B. C., or later, give us the following parallels: SOVEIS 'suis,' IOVENT 'iuvent' (C. I. L. XI 3078); POVERO 'puero' (ib. III, p. 962); SOVO 'suo' (ib. I 1007; VI 15346); and I note especially monosyllabic SOVEIS (ib. IX 4463). So in Old Latin we have FLOVIUS 'fluvius' and ELOVIES 'eluvies.'—It may well be that *u-ac-* is an Italic base derived from *ew-* 'is deficient,' but it is not of the things for which conviction may be demanded any more than for the derivation of Lat. *g-es-* from *ag-*, propounded by Osthoff: *haec olim fuere*.—Space forbids a longer setting forth of objections to the theory under discussion. I shall hope on another occasion to challenge in detail other examples of this alleged change. For my own part, I can not believe it probable that Early Italic *-ov-* from *-ev-* was so different a sound to *-ov-* from *-ow-*.

EDWIN W. FAY.

REPORTS.

PHILOLOGUS, LIII (1894).

I, pp. 1-12. S. Sudhaus: Neue Lesungen zu Philodem (de rhet. I, II). The results of personal examination of the charred papyrus-rolls at Naples.

P. 12. Cr.: Zu dem Elegien-fragment in den Flinders Petrie Papyri II. It begins like a prayer: the whole may have been a marriage-song.

II, pp. 13-37. J. Nusser: Ueber das Verhältniss der platonischen Politeia zum Politikos. The Politikos, now accepted as genuine, was written after the Theaetetus (i. e. after 370 B. C.), and, if Plato, Epist. XIII be genuine, in 364—a date to which the internal evidence also points. The statistical examination of the language groups together the Laws, Philebus, Politikos, Sophistes, and, according to Ritter, also the Timaeus and Kritias. The Politikos was written after the Republic, and is one of the latest of Plato's works. The Politikos shows an advance from the theoretical to the practical: in some details it seems to correct the Republic. Politikos 309 C disagreeing with Rep. X, presupposes Timaeus 69 D, and hence is later than the Republic.

III, pp. 38-45. J. Zahlfleisch: Aristotelisches. Proper understanding of the context of Pol. 1276a, 13-16 shows many changes of punctuation and emendation to have been unnecessary. The same conservative criticism is applied to passages in the Metaphysics, Ethics, etc.

IV, pp. 46-79. C. Wunderer: Textkritische Untersuchungen zu Polybios. I. The writer defends the MSS against the editors in 14 places. II. Thirteen new conjectures are offered and discussed. III. The readings are given of B, the so-called Laurentianus, for the last fifty years in the British Museum; a copy called for convenience *b* (Plut. 69, cod. 9) is in the Laurentian Library in Florence.

P. 79. O. Crusius: Zu den Canidia-Epoden des Horaz. All difficulties disappear if the speaker of the recantation called in vs. 58 *Esquilini pontifex venefici* is not Horace, but the *senex adulter* of Epode V, 57 ff.

V, pp. 80-126. U. Wilcken: Ὑπομνηματισμοί. W. had devoted several years to the official journal of Aurelius Leontas, στρατηγός in the district of Elephantine under Septimius Severus, which has

been preserved in some papyrus fragments in the Louvre. Text and interpretation of these accounts of monthly trips, and a discussion of ancient journals are given. The journal of Alexander the Great was the main source of the memoirs of Ptolemy I, which were the authority for Arrian's *Anabasis*.

VI, pp. 127-31. A. Funck: Zu Petronius und lateinischen Glossaren. Discussion of *acetabulum*, *periscelides*, *tonstrinam*, *ursina*, *lacticulosus*, *oclopetta*, *hoc suum*, *inter duo*, *opposita ad os*, *male dicere aliquem*.

P. 131. O. Crusius: Note on *acetabulum*, δξύβαφον.

VII, pp. 132-46. F. L. Gauter: Q. Cornuficius, a contribution to the history of the senatorial party in the last years of the republic. We first meet Q. C., Cicero's friend, in 48 B. C., as quaestor of Caesar, cos. II, who sent him in the summer of 48, before Pharsalus, into Illyria with two legions. In 47 he was besieged by M. Octavius, and relieved by Vatinius. In the beginning of 46 he was sent to Cilicia. He was not there in 45 (evidenced by the absence of the Cic. correspondence with him). In 44 by senatus consultum he was governor of Africa Vetus (Cic. ad fam. XII 20-30).

VIII, pp. 147-89. M. Krascheninnikoff: Die Einführung des provincialen Kaiserkultus im römischen Westen. The object is to determine the date of introduction of the worship of the emperors by entire provinces (in distinction from the municipia), especially in Narbonese Gaul and Baetica. The chief evidence is the Narb. law on a bronze tablet, C. I. L. XII 6038 and Tac. Ann. I 78: datumque in omnes provincias exemplum. It seems most likely that it was Vespasian who instituted the cult and that it was introduced into both provinces at the same time.

Miscellen, pp. 190-200.—1, pp. 190-91. R. Hartstein. In Hom., Od. IV 481 ff. the river not the country Αἴγυπτος is meant; co-ordination is required; hence read Αἴγυπτόν τ' for Αἴγυπτόνδ'.

2, pp. 191-4. H. Deiter gives a description and some readings of a comparatively valueless 13th-cent. Amsterdam MS of Cic. Philippics.

3, pp. 194-7. H. Meyer: Die Glossen in der Berliner Statius-Handschrift.

4, pp. 197-8. K. Tümpel: Tethys und die Tethysmuschel. These shell-fish, variously called τήθεα, τήθηα, ὠρία, etc., were in the Peloponnesus dedicated to Aphrodite, while in the more northern regions, to the mother of the Sea-Tethys.

5, pp. 198-200. E. Nestle: Etwas antikritisches zu dem kritischen Briefe über die falschen Sibyllinen, interprets ἐπεπότησε (Hellenistic for ἐπεπορήθη) in Septuag. Deut. 32. 11.

IX, pp. 201-13. F. Dümmler: Der Ursprung der Elegie. The ancient testimonies have been misunderstood. The elegy was

originally a patriotic exhortation arising from a sort of religious enthusiasm.

P. 213. Cr.: R. Volkman über die Sprache der Sibyllinen. Strange forms—perhaps belonging to the colloquial Greek—are not to be rejected for the sake of smoothing the verse.

X, pp. 214-16. W. Hörschelmann: Die Betonung des Choliambus. Ovid, Remed. 361, *extremum seu trahat pedem*, seems to indicate that there was a *ritardando*, not a shift of accent, at the close of the verse.

Pp. 216-27. O. Crusius cites additional evidence for the preceding thesis, shows how the erroneous method of reading came about through the tendency to put the strongest expiratory stress on the accented syllable, and adduces with approval the French habit where the tendency to give stress accent is less (cf. Chaignet, *Essais de métrique grecque*).

P. 227. Cr.: Babrius 95, 106. The authors of the *epimythia* or 'morals' were disposed to read a didactic purpose into the Fables of Babrius, whereas he has written for the most part mere animal-stories.

XI, pp. 228-52. O. Crusius: Fabeln des Babrius auf Wachs-tafeln aus Palmyra. These wax tablets, containing fourteen fables, are the efforts of a schoolboy. The text is inferior to that of the MSS; they show that Babrius was a Hellenized Roman of the beginning of the third century A. D. living in Syria.

XII, pp. 253-79. R. Peppmüller: Bemerkungen zu den home-rischen Hymnen (Hymns to the Delian and Pythian Apollo).

P. 279. R. Peppmüller, Hesiod, Theog. 466, reads *ὄγ' ἄρ'*.

XIII, pp. 280-322. A. Rzach: Zur Kritik der Sibyllinischen Orakel, combats the views of Buresch.

P. 322. O. Cr.: Ein griechisches Sprichwort bei Ammian. XXIX 2. 25 *στέφε τὴν τύλην*.

XIV, pp. 323-33. K. Zacher: Thongefässe auf Gräbern. Testimonia from the poets, e. g. Aristoph., Eccles. 1108 ffg., and the evidence of excavations. According to Brückner (Athen. Mitt. 1893, 92 ff.) the *lekythoi* on the grave contained the libation for the dead, as is shown by the hole in the bottom.

XV, pp. 334-43. H. Blümner: Die trözenischen Fragmente des Edictum Diocletiani. Text after Legrand's copy, with transcription and interpretation.

XVI, pp. 344-51. J. Zingerle: Zu griechischen Inschriften. New readings for the *tabella devotionis* from Hadrumetum and various sepulchral inscriptions.

XVII, pp. 352-61. A. Milchhoefer: *Ὀπισθόδομος*. It seems likely from C. I. A. I 32, 109, etc., that the treasure-house was a

separate building, and that the name Parthenon applied to the west cella arose to differentiate it from the opisthodomos (Aristoph. Plut. 1193; Lysistr. 483).

P. 361. P. Sakolowski emends Anth. Pal. V 41, ἐβλεπε to ἐλέει.

XVIII, pp. 362-77. W. H. Roscher: Die Sagen von der Geburt des Pan. Fourteen different legends, of which (a) the majority, including the oldest, are traceable to local Arkadian cults, and (b) most name a nymph, Kallisto, Oenoe, et al. as the mother of Pan.

Miscellen, pp. 378-84.—6, pp. 378-80. R. Hartstein: Zu Telemach's Reisebericht. Od. XVII 107-49, αὐθι ἐπειτα for αὐτίκ' ἐπειτα makes XVII 120 agree with IV 585 ff.

7, pp. 380-81. R. Peppmüller emends Od. κ 116 to ἐν νηὶ θοῇ.

8, pp. 381-3. M. Schneider: Zu Matron. Conviv. Attic. 18 ff., emends (after Hom., Il. Ψ 61) to ὥς or ἄτε. In Fr. II he conjectures ἄοχοι for ἀοιδοί.

9, pp. 383-4. L. Traube: Quaestiuncula Apuliana, retains *cole* (= *caule*) in Apul. Met. VI 6.

XIX, pp. 385-99. A. Milchhoefer: "Orphisch"-Unterweltliches. Orpheus playing his lyre before the abode of Hades, as represented on grave-vases, seems rather to be praying for the return of Eurydice than that his followers might enter the happy life.—Then follow observations confirming Wilamowitz's opinion (Hom. Unt., S. 199) that Hom., Od. λ 665-77 is an Orphic interpolation of the time of Peisistratos.

P. 399. O. Cr.: κηρῶν λεπτότερος. Eustath. ψ 72, p. 1288, 46, quotes from Athen. X, p. 55, but adds the strange phrase "thinner than ghosts" from an unknown source. If they are the words of Eustathios, κηρῶν has retained the ancient meaning.

XX, pp. 400-15. A. v. Premenstein: Nemesis und ihre Bedeutung für die Agone. Fear of Nemesis, who would punish excess, kept the Greek from showering costly honors on the victor. She was protectress of the national contests, as is evidenced by Lydus, de mensibus 1. 12, the only direct testimony; statues found at Olympia in the Stadion (Treu, Ausgrab. III, p. 12) and the altar of the Roman period found in the theatre of Dionysos at Athens, [τῇ] Νεμέσει. Later Nemesis passes into the goddess of vengeance.

XXI, pp. 416-28. W. Kroll: Adversaria Graeca, emends 10 passages of Proklos; 7 in Parisian, 6 in London, and 3 in miscellaneous papyri; 6 in Hermes Trismegistos; 2 in Iamblichos; 29 in Damaskios.

P. 428. Cr.: Ad Babrii fabulas Palmyrenas, adds to Philol. 53, p. 228, 5 conjectures.

XXII, pp. 429-35. E. Ziebarth (from the MS of the late H. Sauppe): Zu den rhetorischen Schriften des Dionysios von Halikarnass, contains some 150 emendations.

P. 435. K. Löschhorn: Sophokles, Philoktet. 1149, conjectures $\phi\upsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\ \mu'$ for $\phi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\epsilon\tau'$.

XXIII, pp. 436-41. C. Wunderer: Ein Ephorusfragment bei Polybios (XII 16). The source is not Timaeus.

XXIV, pp. 442-8. C. E. Gleye: Die Abfassungszeit von Arrian's Anabasis. Lucian's Historia Quomodo Conscribenda, written in 165 A. D., contains allusion to Arrian's Prooemium, and must have been written very soon after. Nissen's view that Lucian did not know Arrian's Anabasis can not stand.

XXV, pp. 449-64. R. Fuchs: Simeon Seth und der cod. Par. graec. 2324, S. xvi. Readings of the Parisinus compared with the other MSS and editions of Simeon Seth.

XXVI, pp. 465-504. F. L. Gauter: Das stoische System der *αἰσθησις* mit Rücksicht auf die neueren Forschungen. Gauter often agrees with Bonhöffer (Epictet und die Stoa), but generally differs from both Bonhöffer and Stein (Die Psychologie der Stoa).

P. 504. Crusius: Zu den delphinischen Hymnen, contains several new readings and restorations.

XXVII, pp. 505-34. W. Hoehler: Die Cornutus-Scholien zu Juvenal's VI Satire. Given in full with index verborum.

XXVIII, pp. 534-43. E. Samter: Der pileus der römischen Priester und Freigelassenen. Supplementary to Helbig's paper (Sitz.-Bericht d. Ak. d. W. zu München, 1880, S. 487 ff.) and deals with the literary testimonia. Donning the pileus (made *ex pelle hostiae caesae*) symbolized the clothing of the priest with the skin of the victim, and not only that the priest offered himself to the gods, but that he was also the consecrated property of the gods. (2) The freedman wore the pileus because originally he was lustrated *capite raso et velato*.

P. 543. O. Cr. *μαγφδός* is to be explained as *μαγ[αδ]φδός* by syllabic hyphaeresis.

XXIX, pp. 544-53. K. Tümpel: Der Karabos des Perseus. Mykenai, the native city of Perseus, connected the spiny-lobster (*κάραβος*) with his cult. The *κάραβος* is present in the hydra-myth. Herakles appears as its champion against the hydra, which is to be taken as a polyp, whose enmity for the *κάραβος* is given by Aristotle, H. A. VIII 34.

XXX, pp. 554-61. P. Knapp: Nike und Eos. In vase-paintings there is often present with Nike a youth with a lyre, who is to be taken as her favorite.

P. 561. W. Knoll: De Orphicis addendum, discusses Mnemosyne, XXII 286-329.

Miscellen, pp. 562-76.—10, pp. 562-3. O. Immisch: Ad Tyrtæum, fr. 9 (7).

11, pp. 564-7. Fr. Susemihl: Die *Πευθεπιχάρμεια*.

12, pp. 567-72. E. Holzner: Zu Euripides Iphigenie in Aulis, has conjectures for vv. 373, 1179, 1207 and 864.

13, pp. 572-6. Th. Stangl: Zu den Epitomatoren des Valerius Maximus. Remarks on some points of language.

P. 576. O. Cr.: Herondas, II 6.

XXXI, pp. 577-87. F. Krebs: Aus dem Tagebuch des römischen Oberpriesters von Aegypten. MSS 347 and 82 of the Berlin Papyri. The *ἀρχιερεύς* gives his official permission for the circumcision of a boy.

P. 587. C. E. Gleye: Zu den Nachrichten vom Tode Julians.

XXXII, pp. 588-628. W. Soltau: Die griechischen Quellen in Livius' 23-30. Buch. Too important and long to be well condensed. In bk. 23 no Polybian influence. In 24 and 25 Caelius was at first used, but in the revision of it Polybius. In 26-9 the notes on the Spanish wars came from Polybius through Claudius, who translated into Latin portions of Polybius and Acilius. The Greek sections in 27 are based on Polybius, while in 30 Livy follows him quite consistently.

XXXIII, pp. 629-86. A. Schulten: Die Landgemeinden im römischen Reich. I. Pagus—the outlying district about a city. (a) Pagani were closely bound to the worship of the rural divinities, hence their religious conservatism and determined stand against the Christian religion. (b) The pagani in historical times form a respublica like every collegium and pass decrees—pagi scitus (C. I. L. X 3772, etc.). There were leges paganae and magistri pagi; but the original independence was supplanted when the city set over them praefecti pagi. II. The vicus was formed by the association together of the individual possessors. After the Italian war, they lost their autonomy and became either cities, or villages in a city-district. III. Pagus et civitas referred to a community within a community development in Africa, of a village about a castellum. IV. This castellum, to which the rural community looked, had at first no political organization or rights.

XXXIV, pp. 687-716. O. Baumstark: Beiträge zur griechischen Litteraturgeschichte. (1) The *Γεωργία* of Orpheus stands in no relation to the work of Hesiod. (2) Observations on Lysimachus of Alexandria, who is put at 120-45 B. C. (3) Dionysus of Chalkis flourished in the 2d century B. C. (4) Lysanias of Kyrene. Didymus, ad Euripides, Hec. 3 and Androm. 10, quotes Lysanias *περὶ ποιητῶν*.

tains some interesting details. The full name αὐλος αὐουίλλιος φλακκος occurs only here. [The spelling αὐουίλλιος is noteworthy.] The date of the papyrus is the 21st year of the reign of Tiberius.

3. Pp. 28-36. Victor Mortet critically discusses Vitruvius Rufus 39 (on the measurements of heights) and 39 (bis) on arches, and a fragment in the library of Valenciennes compiled from Vitruvius (I 3 and 4) on the proportions of columns.

4. Pp. 37-54. The Temple of Didymean Apollo, by B. Hausoullier. The author proposes to discuss the chronology of the construction of this temple, which was never completed. In this preliminary article he carefully examines several inscriptions which report progress in the construction. A few new technical words are pointed out.

5. Pp. 55-7. Critical discussion of Plaut., Curcul. 16-19, 28-9, 33-8, 219-21, by Georges Ramain.

6. Pp. 58-61. Critical discussion of Phaedrus, I 16. 2; IV 9. 6; 22. 5, by Louis Havet.

7. P. 61. B. H. corrects an error in the important decree published in the *Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική*, 1897, p. 173, showing that ΤΟΝ ΔΕΜΟΣΙΟΝ is τὸν δημόσιον, not gen. pl.

8. Pp. 62-76. Critical notes on sixty-three passages of Dion Chrysostomus, by Henri Weil.

9. Pp. 77-92. The chronology of the works of Tertullian, thoroughly discussed by Paul Monceau.

10. Pp. 93-7. On Carpus of Antioch, by Paul Tannery. This article discusses the question whether Carpus lived before or after Geminus, and shows that he *may* have lived after him.

11. Pp. 98-109. Book Notices. 1) Michel Bréal, *Essai de sémantique*, Paris, 1897. Highly commended by Louis Duvau. 2) J. Kublinski, *De Sapphus vita et poesi*, Pars prior, Premisliae, 1897. Brief but, on the whole, favorable mention. 3) Parmenides *Lehrgedicht*, griechisch und deutsch, von H. Diels, Berlin, 1897. Highly praised by P. Couvreur. 4) Bernh. Heidhues, *Ueber die Wolken des Aristophanes*. Beilage zum Programm des Königl. Friedrich-Wilhelms-Gymnasium zu Köln, 1897. Reviewed by Albert Martin, who begins: "Le bon sens et le bon goût finissent un jour ou l'autre par triompher. Cela arrive même en Allemagne: la présente dissertation en est la preuve." And this because "le savant allemand est convaincu que les *Nuées* sont une pièce bien faite, que rien n'est plus claire, plus naturel, plus logique que la marche de l'action." The reviewer regrets that the author is unacquainted with a work of M. Denis, who holds the same view. Heidhues thinks that the parabasis proper, and it alone, was rewritten. M. Martin thinks it is not proved that the *Agon* of the *Δόγοι* was in the original play. It is to be hoped that this sort of "common sense and good taste" is a monopoly of Messrs. Denis,

Heidhues, and Martin. 5) Thukydides erklärt von J. Classen. Erster Band. Vierte Auflage bearbeitet von J. Steup, Berlin, 1897. E. Chambry gives a tolerably full criticism of this work, and, while he admits that some improvements have been made, he considers the changes, on the whole, as being for the worse. 6) Giovanni Vailati, Del concetto di centro di gravità nella statica d'Archimede, Turin, 1897. Paul Tannery, in making favorable mention, points out one or two errors. 7) Plutarchi Moralia, vol. VII ed. Gregorius N. Bernadakis, Plutarchi fragmenta . . . continens, Leipzig, 1896. Mentioned by Albert Martin, who finds that the work is not without fault but still makes a step in advance. 8) Tryphiodori et Colluti carmina ad codicum fidem recensuit . . . Guilielmus Weinberger, Leipzig, 1896. Albert Martin points out some *desiderata*, but recognizes the merits of this work. 9) J. Viteau, Passions des Saints Écaterine et Pierre d'Alexandrie, Barbara et Anysia, publiées d'après les mss. grecs de Paris et de Rome avec un choix de variantes et une traduction en latin, Paris, 1897. Commended by B. Haussoullier, who regrets the absence of an introduction and the meagreness of the notes. 10) Lionel Horton-Smith, Two Papers on the Oscan Word ANASAKET, London, 1897. The author considers the word a transcription of ἀνάθηκε: a view rejected by the reviewer, Louis Duvau. 11) Giacoma Tropaea, Il nome Italia, Messina, 1896. Noticed favorably by L. D. 12) Otto Ribbeck, Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta tertiis curis recognovit. Vol. I: Tragicorum fragmenta, Lipsiae, 1897. Noticed briefly by Philippe Fabia. This edition is, of course, an improvement over the former editions, but the Index and the Conspectus metrorum are omitted. 13) V. Landström, Aussen oder innen? Einige Bemerkungen zur Inszenierung der römischen Komödie (in *Eranos*, Acta philologica Suecana, 1896, pp. 95-110). Philippe Fabia states contents, and finds the paper very important despite its brevity. 14) M. Tullii Ciceronis Cato Major, erklärt von Julius Sommerbrodt, 12. Aufl., Berlin, 1896. Commended by Philippe Fabia.

No. 2.

1. Pp. 113-31. The Temple of Didymean Apollo (second article), by B. Haussoullier. Examination of several inscriptions, the dates of some being exactly determined (B. C. 160-154).

2. P. 132. H. Diels shows that APEINON (ἄπεινον) in an inscription of Delos is an adjective, ἀπείνως, from a noun represented by the Modern Greek ἄρεος (*quercus ilex*).

3. Pp. 133-45. Julius Paelignus, Praefect of the Watch and Procurator of Cappadocia, by Philippe Fabia. This article demonstrates that 'Laelianus' in Dion Cassius, LXI 6. 6, is an error, and that Paelignus is meant. The article contains many interesting details.

4. Pp. 146-62. Latin Numerical Alphabets, by Paul Lejay.

A painstaking and laborious investigation of the use of letters as numerals in Latin.

5. Pp. 163-9. Epigraphic Notes, by B. Haussoullier. Examination of inscriptions relating to 'Απόλλων Κραταεανός, Ζεὺς Κερσοῦλλος, and Ζεὺς Ἐπικάρπιος, found chiefly in Asia Minor.

6. Pp. 170-76. Vergil, Eclogue, I 5, by Georges Romain. He denies the correctness of the usual interpretation, grammatically and otherwise, and maintains that the meaning is: "You teach the beautiful Amaryllis to make the woods resound." He holds that Amaryllis is to be conceived of as being present, and points out several evidences of this in the rest of the poem.

7. P. 176. Armand Dauphin reads, Soph. Phil. 32, ὁ δ' ἐνδον οἶκος ποῖός ἐστι; τίς τροφή;

8. Pp. 177-8. Louis Havet points out that the soldier (*cinaedus habitu sed Mars viribus*) whose exploit is portrayed in Phaedr., Append. Perott. 8, represents Chaerea, the assassin of Caligula, and that the story was borrowed from Varro (Plin., N. H. 7, 81). The original soldier was the Tritannus of Lucilius ap. Cic. Fin. I 9.

9. Pp. 178-82. Louis Havet emends six passages of Cic. Fin. I.

10. Pp. 182-3. M. L. Earle directs Keelhoff's attention to the fact that in his article on the construction of verbs of hindering (Rev. d. Phil. XXI, p. 179 ff.) he disregarded the distinction pointed out by Koch between the two conceptions εἶργει | σε τοῦτο ποιεῖν and εἶργει σε | τοῦτο ποιεῖν, with its application to the other formulae.

11. Pp. 184-95. Notes on Bacchylides, by A. M. Desrousseaux. The subject sufficiently indicates the character of these notes. The article begins: "Tout le monde, sauf quelques habiles du Royaume-Uni, que rien ne saurait satisfaire, s'accorde à féliciter M. Frederic G. Kenyon de la façon dont il a compris et exécuté sa tâche de premier éditeur de Bacchylide."

12. Pp. 196-211. Book Notices. 1) G. F. Hill, Sources for Greek History between the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars, Oxford, 1897. Noticed by B. Haussoullier, who gives an analysis, points out several serious faults, but finds the work on the whole excellent. 2) Johannes Toepffer, Beiträge zur griechischen Altertumswissenschaft, Berlin, 1897. Max Niedermann commends the friends who have collected into this volume so many valuable articles of the lamented author. 3) Arthur Brock, Quaestionum grammaticarum capita duo, Dorpat, 1897. Max Niedermann gives a *précis*. The subjects treated are, I. Superlative forms. II. Perfects in -vi in Plautus and other iambic poets. 4) H. de la Ville de Mirmont, La vie et l'œuvre de Livius Andronicus (reprint from the Revue des Universités du Midi, 1896-97). Mentioned

rather unfavorably by Philippe Fabia. 5) The *Pseudolus* of Plautus, edited with introduction and notes by H. W. Auden, Cambridge, 1896. Philippe Fabia finds this work scholarly, but not without serious faults. 6) Jos. Koehm, *Quaestiones Plautinae Terentianaeque*, Diss. inaug., Giessen, 1897. Brief but very favorable mention by Ph. F. 7) Cicero's journey into exile, by Clement Lawrence Smith, Boston, 1896. Highly commended by Philippe Fabia. 8) Th. Zielinski, *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*, Teubner, 1897. Brief but highly laudatory mention by Ph. F. 9) Francis W. Kelsey, *Caesar's Gallic War*, with an introduction, notes, and vocabulary, Boston, 1897. Highly commended, with some slight reservation as to certain details, by E. Chambry. 10) C. Julii Caesaris cum A. Hirtii aliorumque supplementis ex recensione Bernardi Kübleri.—Vol. III, pars prior. *Commentarius de Bello Alexandrino* rec. B. Kübler.—*Commentarius de Bello Africo* rec. Ed. Wölfflin, Leipzig, 1897. E. Chambry, with some slight reserve as to a few matters of detail, bestows high praise upon this work as meeting a long-felt want affecting the scientific restoration of Latin texts. 11) Pierre de Nolhac, *Le Virgile du Vatican et ses peintures*, Paris, 1897. Pronounced by Max Niedermann a profound and able study of this famous MS. 12) Émile Thomas, *Rome et l'Empire aux deux premiers siècles de notre ère*, Paris, 1897. Max Bonnet finds this a very interesting work for the public, but regrets that so distinguished a philologist should for a moment desert the ranks of true scholarship. 13) *Livy, Book I*, by John K. Lord, Shewell and Sanborn, Boston, New York, Chicago, 1897. Philippe Fabia finds fault with the general plan of the "Students' Series of Latin Classics," to which this book belongs, and finds special fault with this particular work. Speaking of the advantages and disadvantages of quantity marks, he says: "Seulement, pour le surplus, prononceront-ils à l'anglaise?" Here he betrays a misconception which is very widespread among European scholars. 14) M. Annaei Lucani *de Bello Civili Liber VII*, with introduction, notes, etc., by J. P. Postgate, Cambridge, 1896. Highly commended by Philippe Fabia. 15) *Lucii Apulei Metamorphoseon Libri XI*, ed. J. Van der Vliet, Leipzig, 1897. M. Laurent comments on some details and concludes: "L'édition de V. d. V. rendra de bons services à condition que l'on se mette en garde contre les principes et la virtuosité de son auteur." 16) *Julii Firmici Materni Matheseos Libri VIII*, ediderunt W. Kroll et F. Skutsch. *Fasciculus prior IV priores et quinti prooemium continens*, Leipzig, 1897. Max Bonnet comments on this work for the most part very favorably, but dislikes the German punctuation, especially the frequent parenthesis marks. 17) *Dicta Catonis vulgo . . . Disticha de moribus . . . recognovit . . . Michael Autore*, Neapoli, 1897. Max Bonnet criticises this work rather unfavorably. He finds it very much like—too much like—the edition of Némethy (Budapest, 1895).

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, herausgegeben von FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH und PAUL HAUPT. Vierter Band, Heft 1 (pp. 1-154). Leipzig, 1899.¹

The first Heft of the fourth volume of the Beiträge contains four articles.

The first of these (pp. 1-77) is an exhaustive treatise by Victor Marx on the position of women in Babylonia as illustrated by the contract literature dating from Nebuchadnezzar until Darius (604-485 B. C.). This work is a dissertation for the Doctorate which was handed in at the University of Breslau. Victor Revillout, in the *Revue égyptologique*, iii^e année, nr. IV, pp. 183-6, had already published an article entitled 'Les droits des femmes dans l'ancienne Chaldée,' in which, however, he dealt exclusively with the condition of the female slaves. To this paper Marx owed his first interest in the subject, ample materials for the elucidation of which he found in the contracts published by Demuth, Evetts, Peiser, Strassmaier, Tallqvist and Ziemer. Marx avoids all discussion of the condition of the female slaves, however, regarding this very properly as a special study in itself which would necessitate a thorough examination of the documents pertaining to the slaves in general.

His present treatise, which is a very important contribution to Babylonian juristic literature, is divided into six heads. Under the first, A. (pp. 2-4), he publishes two documents illustrative of business contracts made by or in the interest of unmarried girls, which show plainly that Babylonian maidens could possess property in their own right.

Under the second head, B. (pp. 4-43), we find a full discussion of the interesting subject of matrimony, which is again subdivided into four sections: e. g. marriage contracts (pp. 4-11); the dependence of the son on his father's wishes in the choice of a wife (pp. 11-12); dowry (pp. 13-39); and the documents treating of the personal relations and support of married women (pp. 40-43).

Under the title of dowry he publishes: 1) a specimen of a dowry contract, stating the amount and the nature of the property to be given (pp. 13-14); 2) documents illustrating by whom the dowry might be paid (e. g. by the father, both parents, mother, or brothers; pp. 14-22); 3) a contract dealing with the apportionment of the dower (pp. 22-3); 4) documents relating to the time when the dowry should be paid, i. e. at once, by installments, or in bulk after a term of years (pp. 24-5). It is clear, furthermore, that the dowry could be regarded as a legally collectable debt; that it was sometimes paid formally in the presence of a judge; that the son of the house had to pay his sister's dowry at a slight discount, if his deceased father had neglected this obligation during his lifetime, and finally, that the dower might be paid in kind

¹ For the report on Bd. III, Heft 4, see A. J. P. XIX, pp. 108-11.

if actual money were lacking. 5) We see from a document, published p. 28, that the son-in-law was the legal recipient of the dowry, but 6) that the property was always designated as the wife's dower, although the husband received the interest. That the wife retained a proprietary interest in the capital sum is seen from p. 32, where it is stated that a security or bond had to be given for the dower-money, over which the husband had no owner's right. 7) Finally, the money of the dower could be invested in realty by the husband, but in his wife's name.

The documents dealing with the personal relations of married women are quite interesting. We see from pp. 40-41 that the consent of both husband and wife had to be obtained in order to sell their child to be adopted by others, and the same rule seems to have applied in letting property. The woman was regarded, therefore, as having equal rights with the man in certain cases, or, at any rate, as a person entitled to legal recognition. Very little material regarding the husband's duty to support his wife can be gathered from the contracts, but it appears clear that, in the case of a divorce or legal separation, the husband was bound to pay alimony according to his means.

The third head of the article, C. (pp. 43-60), treating of transactions performed by women, the author has subdivided in six sections; viz. I. Business transactions which were usually performed in common by husband and wife: *a*) borrowing, *b*) lending, *c*) sales, *d*) purchases, and *e*) exchanges of property. In these common transactions the man alone seems to have been responsible as a guarantor. Thus, in case a slave given as a security for a debt should escape, the man only was responsible for the loss to the creditor. He either had to restore the slave or pay the interest agreed upon in case of such a flight, e. g. $\frac{1}{2}$ a shekel a month. In a number of instances cited p. 47, a wife by her mere presence gave legal recognition to her husband's transactions. II and IV.¹ Independent transactions of married women all related to money, which they could lend or borrow, to realty, which they could sell or let, or to slaves, whom they could buy or sell. In many cases the husband appeared as a witness of his wife's acts (pp. 48-9, 50-54). III. Married women could also enter into business transactions with other men besides their husbands (pp. 49-50). V. Women who were apparently not married could also borrow, lend, own realty, or deal in slaves (pp. 54-8). VI. The author is not very clear on the subject of a woman's position with respect to guarantees and bail-bonds (pp. 58-60). According to p. 45, in cases where a man and wife gave a guarantee, the man alone is responsible, but from p. 58 we see that women may appear alone as guarantors. This apparent discrepancy may perhaps be explained by assuming that women were held responsible only when no man appeared with them in a

¹ The author has unnecessarily grouped this material under two distinct headings.

transaction (?). VII. In this connection it is interesting to note that sometimes a woman alone could actually represent a man (pp. 59-60).

Under the fourth head of the article, D. (pp. 60-62), the author cites documents which show the position of a woman in a legal suit as plaintiff, defendant, or witness.

The fifth head, E. (pp. 62-9) deals with the legal relations between mother (grandmother) and children (grandchildren), subdividing the subject into eleven sections: 1) common property; 2) common debts; 3) common guarantees; 4) mutual responsibility; 5) property transfers of a mother to her children; 6) mothers as witnesses; 7) inheritance from the mother; 8) disagreements between mother and children (notably between step-mother and stepson); 9) grandmother and grandchildren; 10) father and daughter; 11) relations between brothers and sisters.

The sixth and last head of the article, F. (pp. 69-72), deals with women's rights of inheritance. The treatise closes, p. 72, with a brief appendix treating of sealing contracts, taxation, etc. A paged table of contents and a numbered list of the tablets quoted follow the article, pp. 73-7.

With respect to the philological material, I will call attention only to the author's comparison of *šutāpu* 'companion, partner' with modern Hebrew שותף (p. 60). It would have been more to the point to cite the exactly equivalent Aramaic word שותף. In my opinion, *šutāpu* is a cognate with *šetiptu* = *unqu* 'ring,' II. R. 25, 81. *Šetiptu* and *šutāpu* are both from a stem שתף 'bind' which is well known in Aramaic.

Friedrich Delitzsch supplements Marx's article by a short treatise on the Babylonian juristic literature (pp. 78-87). After commenting on Marx's thesis and calling attention to a number of minor errors in the work, he proceeds to criticise several points in Bruno Meissner's article in B. A. III, pp. 494-523, on the old Babylonian laws which regulate private life. Delitzsch thinks, as did Meissner, that this series belongs to the first Babylonian dynasty, and he even hazards the supposition that Hammurabi himself, the founder of the dynasty, gave orders to codify the laws in question. Delitzsch treats critically six of these laws, translating them somewhat differently to Meissner's version.

Delitzsch points out (pp. 85-7) that the so-called family laws¹ (V. R. 25) were in force at the time of the first Babylonian dynasty, and he considers it highly likely that they were a part of this Hammurabi collection. The family laws of the ancient Babylonians, like the Hebrew Fourth Commandment, show the importance which the ancient Semites attached to a well-ordered household. If we consider that laws covering every relation of private

¹The first of these laws was published by Haupt, *Die sumerischen Familiengesetze*. Leipzig, 1879.

and public life were firmly fixed in Babylonia as early as 2250 B. C., we cannot fail to infer that they must have influenced in a marked degree the social and political views of the early Hebrew nomads who themselves came out of Babylonia centuries after the codes were in practice. It is to be hoped, as Delitzsch says, that during the next twenty years, as the old Babylonian juristic system becomes better known, we shall obtain more and more light on the origin and development of the Mosaic legal compilation.

The third article in the *Beiträge* (pp. 88-100) gives an elucidation of four letters of Hammurabi, king of Babylon, to Sin-idin-nam, king of Larsa. The text is presented by Knudtzon and the remarks on it by Friedrich Delitzsch. In the *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes*, vol. XIX, 1896, pp. 40-44, V. Scheil published three of these documents, of which Knudtzon and Delitzsch now give an improved version. Such a revision is considered necessary, chiefly because Scheil asserted that the name Chedorlaomer (king of Elam, Gen. ix) occurs in one of the documents. Scheil unfortunately gave the text only in a late Assyrian form, instead of adhering to the original archaic Babylonian characters. This naturally makes his work highly unsatisfactory for Assyriologists. Knudtzon and Delitzsch rightly deny that the name Chedorlaomer occurs at all in the passage where Scheil believed it to be, showing that the real text, which Scheil misunderstood, makes such a reading impossible.

The article is followed by two pages of plates (pp. 97-8) giving the original characters of the three tablets published by Scheil.

The fourth and last article of the *Heft* is a new collation by Knudtzon (pp. 101-54) of some of the El Amarna tablets already published by Winckler.¹ Knudtzon, after some introductory remarks relating to his improvements on Winckler's text (pp. 102-16), gives a transliteration of eleven Babylonian tablets (pp. 116-34), of a long inscription in the Mitanni language (WA. 27; pp. 134-53), as well as of the tablet of Tell el Hasi (W. 219; pp. 153-4). The author states that his text improvements are in no way directed against Winckler's scholarship, but rather against Abel's work in autographing the documents. Knudtzon has been the means of effecting an interchange of El Amarna documents between the museums of Berlin and Guise, so that a number of these texts, hitherto fragmentary and disconnected, can now be satisfactorily filled out.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

J. DYNELEY PRINCE.

¹ Winckler and Abel, Berlin edition, WA.; London edition, L.; Winckler, 'Die Thontafeln von Tell el Amarna' in the *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, V. (called W.). Knudtzon follows the last German edition of Baedeker's *Aegypten*, where it is stated that the name El Amarna is better than the former Tell el Amarna.

BRIEF MENTION.

MAASS has followed up his *Aratea* in the *Kiessling-Wilamowitzsche Philologische Untersuchungen* by a volume of 750 pp. entitled *Commentariorum in Aratum Reliquiae* (Berlin, Weidmann), and MAASS's pupil, GEORG THIELE, has published through the same house his *Antike Himmelsbilder*, in which a large space is given to the Germanicus MS in Leiden, the Codex Vossianus (saec. IX), which is "not only one of the important monuments of Carolingian pictorial art, but a still more important specimen of the antique method of illustrating books." This fourth chapter is preceded by chapters on the origin of the Greek constellations, on the Atlas-types and on the zodiac in art. The work is lavishly illustrated and appeals to wider circles. With all our advance in scientific astronomy, the average modern man is not so familiar with the sky as was his antique brother, and some of the blunders in modern works of fiction that are scored from time to time in scientific journals would hardly have been possible for a ploughman of antiquity, not to say a sailor. The world needs every now and then a reminder that the modern head holds different things from the ancient brain-pan, not necessarily more.

The first fascicle to appear, the sixth on the list of the v. WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF *Collection*, gives us an instalment of KAIBEL's *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Berlin, Weidmann), comprising the *Commentaria Vetera de Comoedia Graeca* and the *Comoedia Dorica*, together with the *Mimi* and *Phlyaces*. This portion will be especially welcome to the student of Greek comedy, who will no longer be sent to Ahrens or Lorenz for Epicharmos, or to Ahrens or Botzon for Sophron, and it is a boon to have all this material gathered within the compass of a single volume and handled in a masterly way. The other volumes are to follow at a comparatively early day, and we are led to expect something far different from Kock's disappointing performance, which receives a sharp sentence of reprobation in KAIBEL's preface, where he speaks of "<Meinekii> opus plane admirabile a Theodoro Kock expilatum magis quam ita ut debebat retratum." I have no desire to add here to the cairn that others have raised over Kock's *Fragmenta*, and will refrain from pointing out a number of things that have arrested my attention in a recent stroll through the thick volumes. Some of them, it is true, belong

to spheres in which it is as well not to be too knowing, and I do not wish to imitate the self-satisfied smirk of old Küster when he says on Ar., Eccl. 721: nisi hic locus obscoenus esset, plura ad eius illustrationem afferre possem, nor the lingering protest of Boeckh on Pind., P. 3, 19 (A. J. P. XVI 527). There are Aristophanic scholars who have no need to sigh with the servitor in the Peace: πόθεν ἂν πριαίμην ῥίνα μὴ τετρημένην; Their noses are imperforate. The really sad part is the ineffectual snuffle. But whatever Kock's merits or demerits, few young students can afford to own Kock, and Kaibel's words will comfort them for their restriction to Meineke's smaller edition.

In his *Here and There in the Greek New Testament* (Chicago, Revell), Professor POTWIN has said an emphatic word, still needed in some quarters, on the necessity of a serious study of Classical Greek as an introduction to New Testament Greek. In one of the chapters he takes up the frequency of the Historical Present in the Gospels as a stylistic test. Matthew, it appears, has 93, Mark 143, Luke 16, John 160. 'If Mark be called 1, John 1½, Matthew 1½ and Luke 1¼,' the corrected figures would be Matthew 62, Mark 143, Luke 9, John 128. The disparity is so great that it is not necessary to reduce Professor POTWIN's figures to decimals. But he has not taken into account the proportion of narrative in Mark and in John, which would bring the two still nearer. Comp. A. J. P. IX 153. On the historical present itself see A. J. P. XIV 105, XVI 259. According to Professor POTWIN, the Historical Present does not occur in the Acts, another point that seems to him to make for the common authorship of Acts and Luke. Blass (Grammar, Engl. ed., p. 188) had already noted the rarity, but does not go into details. It really seems as if the correspondent of Theophilus were aiming at a certain dignity of style.

In his thesis *De la déclinaison dans les langues indo-européennes et particulièrement en sanscrit, grec, latin et vieux slave* (Paris, Klincksieck), M. EDOUARD AUDOUIN tries to reconcile the results of syntactical with the results of morphological study. In due course he brings up the question (p. 200), discussed in this Journal (XVIII 119, 120), as to ἐπί with the genitive and ἐπί with the dative. Agreeing, as he does, with Delbrück that ἐπί w. gen. is due to the gen. with verbs of attaining, he finds herein a happy confirmation of the difference that Krüger makes between ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς and ἐπὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ. There is a notion of change, and hence a notion of fortuitousness, in the construction with the gen. ἐπ' ἡπείρου, ἐπὶ χέρσου are opposed to εἰν ἀλί, ἐν πελάγει and imply a

passage from the sea to the continent, whereas in ἐπὶ χθονὶ there is no such change. Hence in Attic ἐπὶ with the gen. gives a fortuitous position, ἐνί with the dat. a permanent position. Still, as ἐπὶ with the dative is also employed after verbs implying change, such as τίθημι, we are not on *terra firma* after all. Unfortunately, Krüger's distinction seems to be hopelessly false, and there is nothing to confirm. The difference between the two constructions is largely that of picturesque effect, as has been pointed out. In this whole domain, however, the linguistic sense of smell is not to be despised. Odors escape the chemist's tests. No Hephaistos with all his ἰδυῖναι πραπίδεςσαι can immesh the loves of prepositions and cases, and the difference between ἐφ' αὐτοῦ γελᾶν and ἐφ' αὐτῷ γελᾶν, which Krüger emphasized (on Xen. Anab. 5, 4, 34), is undeniable, but not easily deducible. The behavior of Anglo-American prepositions ought to give us pause. On this side we are prone to overdo *on* and use it where the English use *in*, and many pages have been written about *in* and *at*—more by despairing Germans than by happy-go-lucky natives.

The general public and the scholarly public alike will doubtless welcome v. WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF'S *German Translations of Greek Tragedies* (Weidmann). Of the four that have thus far appeared, the *Hippolytos* and the *Herakles* are already familiar to the Hellenist, *Oedipus* and *Euripides' Hiketides* (*Der Mütter Bittgang*) are new. As this Journal has never found space for the consideration of such remarkable pieces of English work as Mr. WAY'S *Euripides* (A. J. P. XVIII 245), it is hardly to be expected that any detailed criticism of a German rendering should be undertaken here. In a former volume of the Journal (XIII 517) I ventured to say something about the translation of the *Hippolytos*, and so much interested was I in Wilamowitz's exposition of the art of translation that I failed to verify and correct his quotation of Il. I, 299. It is a poor tribute to the fascination wrought by the brilliant essayist, but it is a manner of tribute after all that so old a hand as the writer of these lines should have sinned against a cardinal law. Add therefore to the many *Errata* of the Journal: "XIII 517, l. 17 from top. Read ἐπεὶ μ' ἀφ' ἑλκεσθὲ γέ δόντες."

Messrs. SIKES and WILLISON have got up a school edition of the *Prometheus Vincit* (Macmillan) which is no worse than the average of text-books manufactured to meet a supposed need. In fact, it is rather better. But the only excuse for mentioning it here is the pretty illustration which the editors have given of the fatality which attends those who make haste to correct mistakes (A. J. P. III 228, note). Eager to score one on Fennell, perhaps

on other editors of Pindar, they inform us (v. 80) that Προμαθέος (Pindar, Ol. VII 80) is 'the Forethinker,' not merely 'abstract Forethought,' and bid us compare Pyth. IV 173. For Pyth. IV 173 read Pyth. V 27 (36). As to the contention, it is naught. What we call abstracts were originally personifications. Dan Forethought has as much right to be as Dan Cupid. USENER's *Götternamen* has put all these matters in a new light (A. J. P. XVII 366).

By the way, it is an old remark that the abstract noun adds σεμνότης to language. σεμνή λέξις ἢ ὀνομαστική καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ ὀνόματα. ὀνομαστικὴν δὲ λέγω τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ῥημάτων εἰς ὀνόματα πεποιημένην κτέ., says Hermogenes in a passage (III 226 W) which has often been quoted (A. J. P. VIII 333) and which I find quoted again by Mr. JOHN D. WOLCOTT in his *New Words in Thucydides* (Tr. Am. Phil. Ass. 1898, p. 143). A similar phenomenon has been noticed in English style. (See my 'Essays and Studies,' p. 155.) Mr. WOLCOTT says that Hermogenes gives the true reason; but Hermogenes gives only a rule, not a reason. For the reason we must look elsewhere. In the first place it is worth noticing that there is a difference in σεμνότης between the nominative of the verbal noun and the oblique cases, for the simple reason that the nominative is apt to hark back to the primal personification. Hence Nägelsbach's stylistic rule that for verbs which express action persons are preferred as subjects to things. To use his illustration (A. J. P. X 37), the Roman, say of the best period, prefers *Caesar virtute atque consilio Galliam perdomuit* or *Caesaris virtute Gallia perdomita est* to *Caesaris fortitudo Galliam perdomuit*. The personifying nominative is too stilted, has too much σεμνότης, and something of the same kind has been noticed in regard to ὑπό with the gen. and ἀβ with the abl. of abstracts (A. J. P. VI 488). But apart from this personifying use, which has been treated in an unpublished dissertation by one of my students, the abstract noun promotes σεμνότης partly by its reserve, partly by its use in periphrasis. The abstract noun does not go into details like the verb, has less sympathy and therefore more true σεμνότης than the articular infinitive, which I have compared somewhere to a tribune of the people, an upstart vulgarian of whom it may be said ὡς σεμνὸς ὁ κατάρτος. The abstract noun wraps itself up in its own worth. And then again in periphrases the abstract noun lays solemn stress on character. We have not merely the ὅγκος of a fuller expression, we have a moral analysis. 'The verb is not suffered to remain as a simple act. The moral responsibility of the doer, the dread irrevocableness of the deed must be emphasized' (A. J. P. XVI 525). So both in reserve and in expansion we have important elements of self-conscious σεμνότης, and one recalls the chapter in which Lotze, *Mikrokosmos* (B. V, K. 2), discusses the moral significance of dress. The abstract noun is now a corset, now the hem of a trailing robe.

G. M. B.: In the study of the rarer absolute constructions—the accusative absolute in Greek, the genitive absolute in Sanskrit—the points of resemblance and of contrast are such as to invite comparison. The Hindu doctrine of *anādara*, which on being sifted (cf. Ferdinand de Saussure, *De l'emploi du génitif absolu en Sanscrit*, Genève 1881) amounts only to the predominance of the adversative relation, recalls how this relation also predominates in the Greek accusative absolute. Besides this in Sanskrit we have only present participles or equivalents, while in Greek the present is at least the most prominent tense; but then that is always the case in the adversative participle. More interesting still is the way in which both languages take distinct positions in relation to the impersonal verb, and positions that are diametrically opposite. In Sanskrit the impersonal verb is excluded from the genitive absolute, while in the Greek accusative absolute the impersonal verb reigns supreme, and for it this is the normal construction. It is with surprise, therefore, that one reads in the interesting monograph already cited, p. 7: “Le génitif *varṣataḥ* ‘*ῥοντος*’ que nous avons cru reconnaître dans les nos. 80 et 81, doit être considéré comme un cas particulier où le sujet reste innommé. Il faut sous-entendre *devasya* ou *Parjanyaasya* car le verbe *varṣati* n’est point impersonnel comme le grec *ῥει*. Aussi, au point de vue syntaxique, ce n’est pas *ῥοντος*, mais bien les locutions telles que *παλλομένων* ‘en tirant au sort’ (Il. 15, 191) qui fourniraient ici le meilleur parallèle.” In reality *ῥοντος* guarantees the personal character of *ῥει*, just as *varṣataḥ* does that of *varṣati*. If further proof were needed, passages in which the subject is expressed might be cited; e. g. M 25 = ξ 457; Hes. W. 488; Alcaios 34. 1; or better still, those in which the subject is not expressed but the gender of the participle shows the personal conception; e. g. Her. 4. 28 *ἐν τῷ τὴν μὲν ὥραιην οὐκ ῥει λόγου ἄξιον οὐδέν* ‘τὸ δὲ θέρος ῥων οὐκ ἀνίει’, a usage so firmly rooted in the language that Socrates cannot free himself from it even after denying the existence of Zeus. Compare the lines in which he replies to Strepsiades’ question, *ἀλλὰ τίς ῥει*; Ar., Clouds 370 f.:

φέρει, ποῦ γὰρ πόποις ἄνευ νεφελῶν ῥοντ’ ἤδη τεθείσασι;
καίτοι χρεὴν αἰθρίας ῥειν αὐτόν, ταύτας δ’ ἀποδημεῖν.

As for the “better parallel,” it is no genitive absolute at all, but partitive; cf. La Roche’s note.

E. W. H.: Prof. HILLEBRANDT’s *Vedische Mythologie*, zweiter Band (Breslau, Marcus), gives a further instalment of the speculations with which the reader of the first volume, issued eight years ago, is already well acquainted. As the author found the moon in that volume, so he continues to discover the same long-lost god in the present essay on Agni, whose “third form” is not the lightning, but the moon, which apparently is hung between the sky and earth in the “interspace.” In this volume, besides

Agni, Ushas and Rudra are interpreted anew. The former becomes Easter (the "three dawns" being the three seasons), while Rudra appears as a questionable star. To explain the Rig-Veda from a classical or from an anthropological point of view and not "from itself" still remains, in Prof. Hillebrandt's eyes, a weakness, if not a lunacy. But to argue about "principles of interpretation" is fruitless. The principal thing in interpretation is to interpret. Who makes clearest what has been obscure is the best interpreter. If Prof. Pischel can illuminate a doubtful Vedic passage with a later form or belief; if Prof. Oldenberg can explain a mysterious Vedic rite on the basis of primitive custom; if Prof. Hillebrandt can prove from the Rig-Veda that Brihaspati is the moon,—why, Heaven be praised for more light. But no one principle applies to all. Much that is Vedic has become distorted or is lost, but much remains to this day. The peasant by the Ganges worships modern gods, but when he wants rain most he still invokes Kālī's husband—Indra! The Sheth of Ahmadâbâd still circumambulates the town during a famine and makes libations to Indra, as a form of the All-God. But otherwise Indra is a dead god. We cannot read this Kālīpati Indra into the Rig-Veda; but, on the other hand, the persistence of the rain-god Indra is not without significance. Prof. Hillebrandt's method of interpretation tends to make him ignore as late and foreign what is not sanctioned by the Veda as he interprets it. Unless infallible, he is thus liable to enter a vicious circle. His interpretation, as giving the judgment of a mature scholar, is welcome; it is valuable if not definitive. But a wider view would, perhaps, not impair the judgment. The author wishes to show that Mātariçvan is wind, because fire is begotten by wind. He wants an illustration (p. 152) of belief in 'automatic' fire, has, however, only the fact of such fire as given in Crooke to fall back on. The Sanskrit epic parallel to Thucydides, ii. 77, would have been nearer the point, since Prof. Hillebrandt here needs not the fact but the native view—and this view is given by what he despises as evidence. Of the Vedic seers, Prof. Hillebrandt says with confidence (p. 6) that they had lost the word for snow, and "knew the snow no more." Snow still falls in the Puñjâb occasionally. The Mahāvagga, too, says, i. 20. 15, that snow falls in winter. To sum up, there are more things in the Puñjâb than are mentioned in the Rig-Veda, and outside information—all information—is necessary to any method of interpreting the oldest literature.

Especial interest attaches to the forthcoming volume (No. IX) of the *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* (Ginn & Co.), which contains memoirs and portraits and posthumous papers of GEORGE M. LANE and FREDERIC D. ALLEN. The Lane memoir is by Professor MORGAN, the Allen memoir by Professor GREENOUGH.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Conway (R. Seymour). *Dialectorum Italicarum exempla selecta*. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 4 + 32 pp. 8vo, cl., net 60 cts.

Euripides. *The Bacchae*; the text and tr. in English verse by Alex. Kerr. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1899. c. 127 pp. 8vo, cl., \$1.05.

— *The Medea of Euripides*; ed., with introd. and notes, by C. E. S. Headlam. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 24 + 122 pp. 16mo, cl., net 60 cts.

Hind (R. D. Archer) and Hicks (R. D.) *Cambridge Compositions: Greek and Latin*. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 12 + 496 pp. (Cambridge University Press Series.) 8vo, cl., net \$2.50.

Homer. *The Seventh Book of Homer's Odyssey*; ed. by C. W. Bain. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1899. c. 11 + 123 pp. 16mo, cl., 45 cts.

Juvenal. *Fourteen Satires*; ed., with introd., notes and index, by J. D. Duff. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 53 + 471 pp. 16mo, cl., net \$1.50.

Longinus (Dionysius Cassius). *On the Sublime*; with introd., translation, facsimiles and appendices, by W. Rhys Roberts. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 10 + 288 pp. 8vo, cl., net \$2.75.

Milton (J.) *Comus and Lycidas*; ed. by A. W. Verity. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 55 + 208 pp. 16mo, cl., net 50 cts.

Nettleship (R. L.) *Lectures on the Republic of Plato*; ed. by G. R. Benson. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 6 + 364 pp. 8vo, cl., net \$2.75.

Plutarch. *Plutarch's Lives: Englished by Sir T. North*; ed. by W. H. D. Rouse. In 10 v. V. 3. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 16mo, cl., 50 cts.; limp leath., 75 cts.

Salva-Webster *English-Spanish Dictionary*, comp. by J. Gomez. New and thoroughly rev. ed.; ed. by F. M. de Rivas. Chicago, *Laird & Lee*, 1899. c. 3 + 383 pp. Maps, il., 16mo, limp leath., \$1.

Schnurmann (Ivan Nestor). *Russian Reader. Lermontof's Modern Hero*; with English tr. and biographical sketch. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 403 pp. 16mo, cl., net \$2.

Thomson (A. Douglas). *Euripides and the Attic Orators*. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 6 + 193 pp. 8vo, cl., net \$1.90.

Virgil. *The Aeneid. Book I*; ed., with notes and vocabulary, by A. Sidgwick. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 104 pp. 16mo, cl., net 40 cts.

— *Aeneidos. Lib. II*; ed. for the use of schools by T. E. Page; with vocabulary by Rev. G. H. Nall. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 26 + 152 pp. 18mo, cl., net 40 cts.

Xenophon. The Hellenica. Books 1 and 2; ed., with introd. and notes, by S. M. Edwards. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 48 + 168 pp. 16mo, cl., net 75 cts.

ENGLISH.

Annual of the British School at Athens, Nos. I-III. Sessions 1894-95, 1895-96, 1896-97. London, 1894-98. 4to. 24s. 6d.

Brown (R.) Researches into the Origin of the Primitive Constellation by the Greeks, Phoenicians and Babylonians. Vol. I. London, 1899. 8vo, 378 pp. 10s. 6d.

Conybeare (F. C.), Harris (J. R.) and Lewes (A. S.) Story of Ahikar from the Syriac, Arabic, Armenian and Other Versions. London, 1898. 8vo. 15s.

Dictionary, Syriac. Founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. Payne Smith. Parts I and II. London, 1898. 4to. à 8s. 6d.

Kenyon (F. G.) Palaeography of Greek Papyri. London, 1899. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Mórfill (W. C.) A Grammar of the Bohemian or Çech Language. London, 1899. 8vo. 6s.

Murray (J. A. H.) A New English Dictionary, on Historical Principles. Vol. V. Heel-Hod. London, 1898. 4to. 5s.

Pliny. Selected Letters. Introduction and notes by J. H. Westcott. London, 1899. 8vo. 6s.

FRENCH.

Gregorii Barhebraei Nomocanon. Ed. (syriace) P. Bedjan, Cong. Miss. Paris, 1899. 8vo, xiii, 551 pp. 27.50 fr.

Jaussen (T.) Grammaire et dictionnaire de la langue maroite. Paris, 1899. 12mo, 388 pp. 20 fr.

Mondon (C.) Grammaire abyssine. (Langue amharique.) Paris, 1899. 8vo. 10 fr.

Reusens (Ch.) Éléments de paléographie. Paris, 1899. 8vo. 25 fr.

Riemann (O.) et Goelzer (H.) Grammaire comparée du grec et du latin (Syntaxe). Paris, 1899. 8vo, 893 pp. 25 fr.

GERMAN.

Aristotelis ars rhetorica. Iterum ed. Adph. Roemer. 8. ciii, 245 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 3.60.

— πολιτεία 'Αθηναίων. Tertium ed. F. Blass. 8. xxxi, 126 S. Ebd. m. 1.80.

Behaghel (Otto). Der Gebrauch der Zeitformen im konjunktivischen Nebensatz des Deutschen. Mit Bemerkgn. zur latein. Zeitfolge u. zur griech. Modusverschiebg. gr. 8. ix, 216 S. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh*. m. 4.40.

Beiträge zur Assyriologie u. semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, hrsg. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. 4. Bd. 1. Hft. gr. 8. 154 S. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 9.50.

Beiträge, Wiener, zur englischen Philologie. Hrsg. v. J. Schipper. IX. Bd. gr. 8. Wien, *W. Braumüller*.—IX. Fischer (Rud.) Zu den Kunstformen des mittelalterlichen Epos. Hartmann's 'Iwain,' das Nibelungenlied, Boccaccios 'Filostrato' und Chaucers 'Troilus and Cryseyde.' xviii, 370 S. m. 8.

Berger (Heinr.) Die Lehnwörter in der französischen Sprache ältester Zeit. 8. iii, 347 S. Leipzig, *O. R. Reisland*. m. 8.

Brunnhöfer (Herm.) Homerische Rätsel. Die homer. Epitheta ornantia. gr. 8. xvi, 136 S. Leipzig, *W. Friedrich*. m. 5.

Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca. Edita consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae. Vol. IV pars 6. Lex. 8. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. —6. Ammonii in Aristotelis analyticorum priorum librum I commentarium. Ed. Max Wallies. xiv, 100 S. m. 4.40.

Corpus glossariorum latinorum a Gust. Loewe inchoatum, composuit, recensuit, ed. Geo. Goetz. Vol. VI. Pars I. gr. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. —VI. Thesaurus glossarum emendatarum, confecit Geo. Goetz. Pars I. x, 368 S. m. 18.

Corpus inscriptionum latinarum, consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae editum. Vol. XIII. Partis I fasc. 1. Vol. XV. Pars II. Fasc. 1. Fol. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. Kart.—XIII. Inscriptiones trium Galliarum et Germaniarum latinae, edd. Otto Hirschfeld et Carol. Zangemeister. Partis I fasc. 1. Inscriptiones Aquitaniae et Lugudunensis, ed. Otto Hirschfeld. 38 u. 519 S. m. 58.—XV, II 1. Dressel (Henr.) Inscriptiones urbis Romae latinae. Instrumentum domesticum. Partis II fasc. 1. Adiectae sunt tabulae duae amphorarum et lucernarum formas exprimentes. S. 491–996. Kart., m. 56.

Dietrich (Rud.) Testimonia de Herodoti vita. Diss. gr. 8. 41 S. Leipzig, *Simmel & Co.* m. 1.

Ephemeris epigraphica, edita iussu instituti archaeologici romani cura Th. Mommseni, I. B. Rossii, O. Hirschfeldii. Vol. VIII. Fasc. 3. Lex. 8. iii u. S. 351–620. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. m. 12.

Euripidis fabulae, edd. R. Prinz et N. Wecklein. Vol. II. Pars III et IV. gr. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. à m. 2.—III. Bacchae. Ed. N. Wecklein. 71 S. m. 2.—IV. Heraclidae. Ed. N. Wecklein. v, 52 S. m. 2.

— Vol. II. Pars V. gr. 8.—II, V. Hercules. Ed. N. Wecklein. v, 72 S. m. 2.40.

Festschrift f. Otto Benndorf. Zu seinem 60. Geburtstage. Mit Titelbild, 12 Taf. u. s. w. gr. 4. xiii, 320 S. Wien, *A. Hölder*. m. 22.

Forschungen zur englischen Sprache u. Litteratur, hrsg. v. Eug. Kölbing. 1. Hft. gr. 8. Breslau, *M. & H. Marcus*.—1. Small (Roscoe Addison). The Stage-Quarrel between Ben Jonson and the so-called Poetasters. ix, 204 S. m. 6.

Fulgentii Opera. Recensuit Rud. Helm. 8. xvi, 216 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 4.

Gregorii Barhebraei Ethicon, seu Moralia. Liber columbae, seu directorium monachorum. Ed. (syriace) P. Bedjan. 8. ix, 18, 605 S. Leipzig, 1898. m. 22.50.

Havestadt (Bern.) Chilidúgu. Lachrymae salutare. Editionem novam immutatam curavit Jul. Platzmann. 8. 78 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 3.

Hillebrandt (Alfr.) Vedische Mythologie. 2. Bd. Usas. Agni. Rudra. gr. 8. iv, 254 S. Breslau, *M. & H. Marcus*. m. 12.

Holder (Alfr.) Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz. 11. Lfg. gr. 8. S. 514–767. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 8.

Horati Flacci (Q.) Opera. Vol. I. Carminum libri IIII, epodon liber, carmen saeculare. Iterum recensuit Otto Keller. gr. 8. cvii, 453 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 12.

Jahrbücher, neue, f. das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Litteratur u. f. Pädagogik, hrsg. v. Ilberg u. Richter. 2. Jahrg. 1899. 3. u. 4. Bd. 10 Hfte. Lex. 8. (3. Bd. 1. Hft. 80 u. 64 S. m. 2 Abbildgn. u. 2 Taf.) Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 28.

Iurisprudentiae antehadrianæ quæ supersunt ed. F. P. Bremer. Pars II. Primi post principatum constitutum sæculi iuris consulti. Sectio I. 8. iv, 582 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 8.

Kirchhoff (Chr.) Dramatische Orchestik der Hellenen. gr. 8. vi, 511 S. m. 2 Taf. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 20.

Lydi (Ioannis Laurentii) Liber de mensibus. Ed. Ric. Wuensch. 8. xcv, 202 S. m. 1 Fig. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 5.20.

Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft. 3. Jahrg. 1898. 7. Hft. gr. 8. Berlin, *W. Peiser Verl. in Komm.*—7. Hüsing (G.) Elamische Studien. I. 42 S. m. 1 Taf. m. 2.40.

— 4. Jahrg. 1899. 1. Hft. gr. 8. Per year, m. 15.—1. Mordtmann (J.) Palmyrenisches. 50 S. m. 4.

Mittwoch (Eug.) Proelia Arabum paganorum (Ajjâm al 'Arab) quomodo litteris tradita sint. gr. 8. 44 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. 1.50.

Mueller (Max). Num Horatii satirarum liber prior retractatus sit. (Diss.) gr. 8. 45 S. Jena, *H. Pohle*. m. 1.20.

Muss-Arnolt (W.) A Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language. (Assyrian-English-German.) Part 8. gr. 8. S. 449-512. Berlin, *Reuther & Reichard*. m. 5.

Némethy (Geyza). De libris amorum Ovidianis. gr. 8. 27 S. Budapest, *R. Lampel*. m. 1.

Palæstra. Untersuchungen u. Texte aus der deutschen u. engl. Philologie. Hrsg. v. Alois Brandl u. Erich Schmidt. II-IV. gr. 8. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*.—II. Coym (Johs.) Gellerts Lustspiele. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des deutschen Lustspiels. vii, 91 S. m. 2.40.—III. Jahn (Kurt.) Immermanns Merlin. v, 128 S. m. 3.—IV. Petsch (Rob.) Neue Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Volksrätsels. viii, 152 S. m. 3.60.

Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio. Edidit Herm. Hitzig, commentarium addiderunt Herm. Hitzig et Hugo Bluemner. Vol. I, pars 2. Liber II: Corinthiaca. Liber III: Laconica. (Auch m. deutschem Titel.) gr. 8. xv u. S. 381-876. Leipzig, *O. R. Reisland*. m. 22.

Poetarum graecorum fragmenta. Auctore Udalrico de Wilamowitz-Moellendorff collecta et edita. Vol. VI, fasc. I. gr. 8. Berlin, *Weidmann*.—VI. Comitorum graecorum fragmenta ed. Geo. Kaibel. Vol. I, fasc. I. Doriensium comoedia Mimi Phylaces. viii, 256 S. m. 10.

Porta linguarum orientalium. Ed. Herm. L. Strack. Pars IV. 8. Berlin, *Reuther & Reichard*.—IV. Socin (A.) Arabische Grammatik. Paradigmen, Litteratur, Uebungsstücke u. Glossar. 4. Aufl. xiii, 169 u. 156 S. m. 6; Schlüssel dazu (m. deutschem od. engl. Titel). à 12 S. à m. 1.50.

Quellenwerke der altindischen Lexicographie. Hrsg. im Auftrage der kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. III. Bd. gr. 8. Bombay. Wien

A. Hölder.—III. Mañkhakoša, der, m. Auszügen aus dem Commentare u. drei Indices. Hrsg. v. Thdr. Zachariae. 7, 73 u. 160 S. m. 7.

Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte. Hrsg. v. W. Braune. B. Ergänzungsreihe. I. gr. 8. Halle, M. Niemeyer.—I. Kluge (Frdr.) Nominale Stammbildungslehre der altgermanischen Dialekte. 2. Aufl. x, 119 S. m. 3.

Schmidt (Max C. P.) Zur Reform der klassischen Studien auf Gymnasien. gr. 8. 40 S. Leipzig, Dürr'sche Buchh. m. —75.

Senecae (L. Annaei) Opera quae supersunt. Vol. III. L. Annaei Senecae ad Lucilium epistularum moralium quae supersunt. Ed. Otto Hense. 8. xl, 621 S. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. m. 5.60.

Simon (Joh. Alph.) Akrosticha bei den augustischen Dichtern. gr. 8. viii, 240 S. Köln, Kölner Verlagsanstalt u. Druckerei. m. 4.

Tacitus. Dialogus de oratoribus. Erklärt v. Const. John. 8. vii, 164 S. Berlin, Weidmann. m. 2.10.

Tobler (Adf.) Vermischte Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik. 3. Reihe. Mit e. Anh.: Romanische Philologie an deutschen Universitäten. gr. 8. xii, 203 S. Leipzig, S. Hirzel. m. 5.

Wellhausen (J.) Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten. 6. Hft. 1. Prolegomena zur ältesten Geschichte des Islams.—2. Verschiedenes. gr. 8. viii, 260 S. Berlin, G. Reimer. m. 8.

ITALIAN.

Ascoli (G. I.) Supplementi periodici all' Archivio glottologico italiano. Disp. 6a. Torino. 8vo, p. 123. L. 6.60.

Bar-Hebraei (Abulfaragii Gregorii). Kithâbhâ Dhiyaunâ seu liber Columbae ed. G. Cardahi. Roma. 8vo. L. 8.

Costa (Emilio). Le orazioni di diritto privato di M. T. Cicerone. Bologna. 8vo, p. 110. L. 4.

Ebn-Malek. L'Alfdah. Testo arabo, traduzione e commenti di Err. Vitto. Roma. 8vo, p. 444. L. 20.

Euripides. Hippolytos, con introduzione, commento e appendice critica di Augusto Balsamo. Parte I, testo critico e commento. Firenze. 8vo, p. 211. L. 2.50.

Monaci (Ernesto). Esempi di scrittura latina del sec. I di Cristo al sec. XVIII. Roma. 8vo, p. 8 e 52 tavole. L. 5.

Pascal (C.) Dizionario dell' uso Ciceroniano. Torino. 8vo, p. 795. L. 8.

Studi italiani di filologia classica. Vol. VI. Firenze. 8vo, p. 492. L. 20.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

American Oriental Society, Journal of the. XX. First half. New Haven, *The Society*, 1899.

Audouin (Edouard). De la déclinaison dans les langues indo-européennes et particulièrement en sanscrit, grec, latin et vieux slave. (Thèse.) Paris, *Klincksieck*, 1898.

— De Plautinis anapaestis. Paris, *Klincksieck*, 1898.

Bauer (Adolf). Die Forschungen zur griechischen Geschichte, 1888-1898, verzeichnet u. besprochen v. A. B. München, *Beck*, 1899.

Bayard (l'Abbé L.) Notes de grammaire latine. Paris, *Klincksieck*, 1898.

Bugge (Sophus). The Home of the Eddic Poems, with a new introduction. Tr. from the Norwegian by W. H. Schofield. London, *David Nutt*. 12s.

Ciceros Rede für L. Murena. Für den Schulgebr. herausg. v. Hermann Nohl. 2te verb. Aufl. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1899. 40 pf.

— Rede für P. Sulla. Für den Schulgebr. herausg. von Hermann Nohl. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1899. 40 pf.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Ed. consilio et impensis Academiae Litterarum Caesariae Vindobonensis. Vol. XXXVIII. Itinera Hierosolymitana. Saec. IIII-VIII ex rec. Pauli Geyer. Vindobonae, *F. Tempisky*. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*, MDCCCLXXXVIII. 15 m. 60 pf.

— Vol. XXXX (Sect. V, Pars I). Sancti Aurelii Augustini de Civitate Dei. Libr. XXII. Ex recens. Emanuel Hoffmann. Pars I. Libri I-XIII. Vindobonae, *F. Tempisky*. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*, MDCCCLXXXVIII. 19 m. 80 pf.

Dictionnaire général de la langue française. Par Hatzfeld, Darmesteter et Thomas. 25. fascicule. Paris, *Ch. Delagrave*. @ 1 fr.

Educational Review, ed. by Nicholas Murray Butler. March, April, May, 1899. New York, *Henry Holt & Co.* \$3 per annum.

Elteri (A.) et Rademacheri (L.) Analecta Graeca. (Bonn Progr.) 1899.

English Dictionary, The Oxford. Ed. by James A. H. Murray. Vol. V. HEEL-HOD. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* 5s. (\$1.25).

Euripide. Iphigénie à Aulis. Texte grec. Recension nouvelle, avec un commentaire et une notice. Par Henri Weil. Troisième édition remaniée. Paris, *Hachette et Cie.*, 1899.

— Médée. Texte grec, avec un commentaire et une notice. Par Henri Weil. Troisième éd. révisée. Paris, *Hachette et Cie.*, 1899.

Harris (M. A.) A Glossary of the West Saxon Gospels. (Yale Studies in English. A. S. Cook, Ed. No. VI.) Boston, *Lamson, Wolfe & Co.*, 1899.

Hillebrandt (Alfred). Vedische Mythologie. Zweiter Band. Breslau, *M. & H. Marcus*, 1889. 12 m.

Hübner (E.) Cicero. (Separatabdruck aus 'Deutsche Rundschau,' April, 1899.)

Kenyon (Frederic G.) The Palaeography of the Greek Papyri. With twenty facsimiles and a table of Greek alphabets. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1899.

Kingsbury (S. S.) A Rhetorical Study of the Style of Andocides. (J. H. U. Diss.) Baltimore, 1899.

Livi (T.) Ab urbe condita, ed. Antonius Zingerle. Lib. XXXI. (Ed. maior.) Vienna, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1899. 50 pf.

Longinus on the Sublime. The Greek text, edited after the Paris MS, with introd., transl., facsimiles and appendices, by W. Rhys Roberts. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1899.

Macdonald (Louise). Catalogue of the Greek and Etruscan Vases and of the Greek and Roman Lamps in the Nicholson Museum. University of Sydney, 1898.

Modern Language Association of America, Publications of the. Ed. by James W. Bright. XIV 12 (N. S., VII 2).—IV. Color in O. E. Poetry (W. E. Mead).—V. From Franklin to Lowell (C. H. Grandgent).—VI. Work of the M. L. A. A. (C. A. Smith).—VII. Are French Poets Poetical? (P. B. Marcou).—VIII. Luis de Léon (J. D. M. Ford). Baltimore, *The Association*, 1899.

Moratin, El si de las niñas. Ed., with introd. and notes, by J. D. M. Ford. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1899. 55 cts.

Muret-Sanders. Encyclopädisches Wörterbuch der englischen u. deutschen Sprache. Teil II. Deutsch-Englisch. Lfg. 10. Gering-gut. In 24 Lfgn. New York, *The International News Co.* @ 1 m. 50 pf.

Nohl (Hermann). Schülerkommentar zu Cicero's Rede für P. Sestius. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1899. 80 pf.

ΟΦΙΟΚΤΟΝΕΙΑ. ΕΥΓΕΝΙΑΣ. Zwei neu-ge[er]fundene Epen in altgriechischer Sprache, herausg. v. H. Chalkeus [J. H. H. Schmidt]. Hagen i/W., *Carl Stracke*, 1899.

Pope. The Iliad of Homer. Books I, VI, XXII, XXIV. Ed., with notes and an introduction, by Albert H. Smyth. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899.

Revue des Humanités en Belgique. Hasselt, 1899.

Sedgefield (W. J.) King Alfred's Old English Version of Boethius de consolatione philosophiam. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899.

Sharp (Granville). China, Anglo-America and Corn. Hongkong, 1899.

Small (R. A.) The Stage Quarrel between Ben Jonson and the so-called Poetasters. (Kölbing's Forschungen zur englischen Sprache u. Litteratur. Heft 1.) Breslau, *Marcus*, 1899. 6 m.

Tacitus. Dialogus de oratoribus, erkl. von Constantin John. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1899. 2 m. 10 pf.

Vox Urbis. Bis in mense prodit. Rome. \$3 per annum.

Whitman (C. H.) The Birds in Old English Literature. (Reprint from the 'Journal of Germanic Philology,' II 2.)

Wiener (L.) Yiddish Literature in the Nineteenth Century. New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1899. \$2.